

Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, and urging its early consideration and passage by Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5435. Also, petition from Ridgely Park, N. J., opposed to Senate bill 1948, House bills 4388 and 9753, or any bills regulating Sunday, as all such legislation is dangerous and should be opposed by every lover of liberty and conscience and friend of pure and undefiled religion; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5436. By Mr. REBER: Resolution adopted by the Lehigh Presbytery, Tamaqua, Pa., indorsing Senate Joint Resolution 31, proposing a constitutional amendment to promote uniform laws on the subject of marriage and divorce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5437. Also, resolution adopted by the Lehigh Presbytery, Tamaqua, Pa., indorsing House Joint Resolution 131, proposing a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy and polygamous cohabitation in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5438. Also, resolution adopted by the Lehigh Presbytery, Tamaqua, Pa., indorsing House bill 9753, to make Sunday a day of rest for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5439. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of Pendleton, Oreg., Presbytery, favoring the passage of House bill 9753, to secure Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5440. Also, petition of Pendleton, Oreg., Presbytery, favoring the passage of House Joint Resolution 159, proposing a constitutional amendment to prohibit sectarian appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5441. Also, petition of Pendleton, Oreg., Presbytery, favoring the passage of House Joint Resolution 131, proposing a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy, etc., in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5442. Also, petition of Pendleton, Oreg., Presbytery, favoring the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 31, proposing a constitutional amendment authorizing Congress to enact uniform laws regarding marriage and divorce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5443. By Mr. WYANT: Resolutions adopted by the Butler Presbytery, United Presbyterian Church, at Butler, Pa., indorsing House bill 9753, to secure Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5444. Also, resolution adopted by the Butler Presbytery, United Presbyterian Church, at Butler, Pa., indorsing House Joint Resolution 131, prohibiting polygamy and polygamous cohabitation in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5445. Also, resolutions adopted by the Presbytery of Butler, United Presbyterian Church at Butler, Pa., indorsing Senate Joint Resolution 31, for uniform laws on the subject of marriage and divorce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, May 4, 1922.

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 20, 1922.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gerry	McKellar	Robinson
Ball	Glass	McLean	Sheppard
Borah	Gooding	McNary	Simmons
Brandegee	Hale	Moses	Smoot
Bursum	Harrell	Myers	Spencer
Calder	Harris	Nelson	Sterling
Capper	Harrison	Newberry	Sutherland
Caraway	Hefflin	Nicholson	Swanson
Culberson	Johnson	Norbeck	Townsend
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Trammell
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Oddie	Underwood
Dillingham	Kellogg	Overman	Wadsworth
du Pont	Kendrick	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Eggle	La Follette	Pepper	Warren
Ernst	Lenroot	Phipps	Watson, Ga.
Fletcher	Lodge	Poin Dexter	Watson, Ind.
France	McCormick	Pomerene	Weller
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Rawson	Willis

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a memorial of the board of governors of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association (Inc.) of Washington, D. C., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation increasing the assessment valuation of real estate in the District of Columbia, as increasing the high cost of living, violating established taxation principles of the American Government, and as being unfair when applied without hearing to citizens not having the franchise and confined to the right of petition, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia, protesting against the enactment of legislation increasing the assessment valuation of real estate in the District of Columbia (in principle), against taxation without representation and the non-hearing of those to be taxed, and also as tending to increase the high cost of living in the District, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions of the Sixteenth Street Highlands Citizens' Association of Washington, D. C., protesting against the enactment of legislation increasing the valuation of real estate in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BALL presented a letter in the nature of a memorial from the board of governors of the Mu-sol-lit Club (Inc.) of Washington, D. C., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation increasing the assessment valuation of real estate in the District of Columbia, as tending to aggravate the already distressing and deplorable housing conditions, and praying for the hearing of those interested in the matter, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Mid-City Citizens' Association of Washington, D. C., protesting against the enactment of legislation increasing the assessment valuation of real estate in the District of Columbia as being detrimental to the already acute housing situation in and the future development of the Capital City, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented resolutions of the board of directors of the Washington (D. C.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the enactment of legislation increasing the rates of taxation on real estate and intangible property in the District of Columbia, particularly (among other reasons) because of the effect it might have in discouraging home building and investments in mortgages, the added burdens to wage earners and persons of small income, and the added encouragement it might afford to the profiteer and extortioner, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Conduit Road Citizens' Association (approved by the Federation of Citizens' Associations), protesting against the enactment of legislation increasing the assessment valuation of real estate in the District of Columbia and favoring the hearing of those interested in the matter, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Real Estate Board of Washington, D. C., protesting against the enactment of legislation increasing the assessment valuation on real estate in the District of Columbia, particularly in view of the disastrous effect it might have on the already acute rental and housing situation in the said District and favoring delay as to changes in the fiscal relations until such time as the matter can be thoroughly considered and all parties afforded a hearing, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Weir, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Kansas State Dental Association at Kansas City, Mo., favoring the enactment of legislation to reorganize and promote the efficiency of the United States Public Health Service, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Topeka, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to control the traffic in narcotics, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 3547) for the relief of Robert G. Hayes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 3548) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Kingsport, Tenn., one German cannon or field-piece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 3549) to tax motor-bus companies and other transportation companies operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 3550) extending the charter and granting certain special privileges to the National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations, a corporation existing under the laws of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment providing that three reserve officers shall be hereafter authorized to be retained on active shore duty in the historical section of the Office of Naval Intelligence, though beyond the age of disenrollment or retirement, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 11228, the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF THE PATENT LAWS.

Mr. STANLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3410) to amend section 4886 of the Revised Statutes relating to patents, which was referred to the Committee on Patents and ordered to be printed.

TARIFF BILL AMENDMENT.

Mr. POMERENE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7456, the tariff bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

OWNER OF THE STEAMER "MAYFLOWER."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1813) for the relief of the owner of the steamer *Mayflower*, which was, on page 1, lines 8 and 9, to strike out the words "and detention of."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

OWNERS OF THE SCHOONER "HORATIO G. FOSS."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1817) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Horatio G. Foss*, which was, on page 1, line 9, to strike out the word "and detention of."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. This is the same amendment which was applied to the other bill. I move that the Senate concur in it.

The motion was agreed to.

OWNER OF THE STEAM LIGHTER "CORNELIA."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1814) for the relief of the owner of the steam lighter *Cornelia*, which was, on page 1, line 9, to strike out the words "and detention of."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

RECLAMATION IN IRRIGATION DISTRICTS—CONFERENCE REPORT (S. DOC. NO. 198).

Mr. McNARY submitted the following report, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4382) to provide for the application of the reclamation law to irrigation districts, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the term 'first mortgage,' as used in section 12 of the Federal farm loan act, approved July 17, 1916, shall be construed to include mortgages on farm lands under United States reclamation projects, notwithstanding there may be against such lands a reserved or created lien in favor of the United States for construction or other charges as provided in the act of June 17, 1902, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, known as the reclamation law: *Provided*, That such lands are otherwise eligible for loans under the Federal

farm loan act: *And provided further*, That the amount and date of maturity of such lien shall be given due consideration in fixing the value of such lands for loan purposes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHAS. L. McNARY,
W. L. JONES,
MORRIS SHEPPARD,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. P. KINKAID,
N. J. SINNOTT,
CARL HAYDEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR POMERENE AT GRANT CENTENARY CELEBRATION.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on the 29th of last month, at the Grant centenary celebration at Georgetown, Ohio, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] delivered a very able and eloquent address. It is rich in historical allusion and patriotic utterance. I ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 8-point type.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

ULYSSES SIMPSON GRANT.

Senator ATLEE POMERENE spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Judge Nichols, members of the Grand Army of the Republic, ladies and gentlemen, we come to Georgetown today to do homage to the great captain of the Civil War. I understand with what pardonable pride the citizens of this good community recite the boyhood deeds of him who rose from comparative obscurity in a few short years to become the great commander of our great armies in suppressing the great rebellion.

BOYHOOD OF GRANT.

General Grant's boyhood days in Georgetown did not differ materially from the youthful days of many Americans in every community in the country. All who knew him or the history of his generation will recognize in him a boy clear of head, pure of heart, and clean of hand. His parents did not permit him to indulge in idleness. He did not fritter away his days. He always was occupied either at school or in his father's tannery or with his team. He was never idle.

His father must have been a very positive character, ambitious for his son's advancement, as any father should be. Full of hope, aye, of confidence, in his future, he determined that his son should have every advantage which his limited means would permit him to give.

Grant the boy does not seem at first to have been ambitious for a military career. In his personal memoirs he tells us that his father had received a letter from Hon. Thomas Morris, United States Senator from Ohio, and after reading it, he said:

"Ulysses, I believe you are going to receive the appointment." "What appointment?" I inquired. "To West Point; I have applied for it." "But I won't go," I said. He said, "He thought I would," and then General Grant adds, quaintly, "I thought so, too, if he did."

Again he tells us that a military life "had no charms" for him, and he did not "have the faintest idea of staying in the Army, even if I should be graduated."

He received his education at the National Military Academy, but his career at West Point can hardly be regarded as a brilliant success if we are to rate him according to prevailing standards. He had an unusually retentive memory. He tells us he "rarely ever read over a lesson the second time during my entire cadetship." He devoted more time to the books in the library than he did to those relating to his course of study. As a result, as he puts it, "I never succeeded in getting squarely at either end of my class in any one study during the four years."

He thought of obtaining a permanent position as a college professor, but he tells us "circumstances always did shape my course different from my plans."

He left the academy "with a good average record as a student and a very high record as a man." It was said of him, "He betrayed no trust, falsified no word, violated no rights, manifested no tyranny, sought no personal aggrandizement, complained of no hardships, displayed no jealousy, oppressed no subordinate, and was ever known for his humanity, sagacity, courage, and honor." Eigh praise this for any man.

His first military service was in the Mexican War. He was then a very young man. He occupied minor positions of responsibility. There is nothing extraordinary in his experience in Mexico, but a careful scrutiny of the history of the Mexican War shows that even in his minor position of lieutenant he always was ready to do and did do his duty.

On one occasion his colonel called for volunteers to get word to General Twiggs, division commander, calling for ammunition and reinforcements. "It is a dangerous job," said Colonel Garland, "and I do not like to order any man to do it. Who will volunteer?" "I will," said Quartermaster Grant promptly, "I have got a horse." "You are just the man to do it," said the colonel. "Keep in the side streets and ride hard." Needless to say, the message was delivered.

While Grant was acting as quartermaster he was always at the front during the fighting. General Longstreet, who served with Grant in Mexico, said of him, "You could not keep Grant out of battle." Again he said, "Grant was everywhere on the field. He was always cool, swift, and unhurried in battle. He was as unconcerned as if it were a hailstorm instead of a storm of bullets. I had occasion to observe his superb courage under fire; so remarkable was his bravery that mention was made of it in the official report, and I heard his colonel say, 'There goes a man of fire.'"

CIVIL LIFE.

Shortly after the close of the Mexican War Grant was sent to the Pacific slope with his regiment. He was separated from family and friends. His record in the far West his most enthusiastic friends can hardly claim to have been creditable. On April 11, 1854, he resigned his position as captain in the United States Army, and apparently his military career had closed. He returned to the East.

Later he located on a small farm which had been given to him by his father-in-law. It was almost entirely, if not quite, virgin soil, covered by a virgin forest.

To use a homely expression, Grant was all but down and out. Almost any other man would have become discouraged and quit. Not so Grant. His clearness of vision and his high resolve enabled him to see his duty to himself, his family, and his country. He cleared the forest. He built his log hut. He plowed and sowed and reaped. He cut firewood and hauled it to St. Louis. He did teaming for his neighbors. Nothing that he found to do was left undone. In this way for a time he maintained himself, his wife, and his growing family.

Later he engaged in the real estate business in St. Louis. He was not fitted for this work. He was not successful in it, and he resigned his position.

Still later, in April, 1860, he went to Galena, Ill., entered his father's leather store, and joined his brothers as salesman.

While in private life he was devotion itself to his wife and children. During all this period he was a great reader, a close student and observer of the passing events which were rapidly drawing the peoples of the North and South into the maelstrom of fratricidal war. He seemed to have a premonition that the fateful struggle was coming.

Hard this life may have seemed to him and his family, as well as to those who knew him, but these experiences were not in vain. They were the crucible in which were melted, purified, and fused together the elements of his manhood. It made him master of himself, and having mastered himself he was fitted to become, and did become, the master and the leader of men. In no period of his life did he develop more than in the time between his resignation and the date when he tendered his services again to his country in the darkest hour of her history.

GRANT IN THE CIVIL WAR.

On May 24, 1861, while at Galena, Ill., Grant wrote to The Adjutant General of the Army at Washington, tendering his services until the close of the war "in such capacity as may be offered." So little was thought of this man that his letter was not even acknowledged.

With that clearness of vision which always characterized Grant, whether in peace or in war, whether in camp or battle, or at the council table, he foresaw the conflict coming. In his judgment it was to decide two questions:

First. Has a State the right to secede from the Union?

Second. Shall we tolerate slavery under the Stars and Stripes?

Grant believed, as Webster believed, that the Union was "one and inseparable." Grant believed with the advancing progress of civilization no human being ought to be held in bondage. In both these beliefs he was right—eternally right; and though we accord to those who held different beliefs honesty of conviction, if these same questions were to be presented now to the people, North or South, for decision at the ballot box they would be decided overwhelmingly in the negative.

Grant, in discussing the question of secession, says, in his memoirs:

Doubtless the founders of our Government, the majority of them at least, regarded the confederation of the Colonies as an experiment. Each colony considered itself a separate government; that the confederation was for mutual protection against a foreign foe and the prevention of strife and war among themselves. If there had been a de-

sire on the part of any single State to withdraw from the compact at any time while the number of States was limited to the original 13, I do not suppose there would have been any to contest the right, no matter how much the determination might have been regretted. The problem changed on the ratification of the Constitution by all the Colonies; it changed still more when amendments were added; and if the right of any one State to withdraw continued to exist at all after the ratification of the Constitution, it certainly ceased on the formation of new States, at least so far as the new States themselves were concerned.

Secession, says Grant, "was illogical as well as impracticable. It was revolution." He believed that as man has the inherent right of self-defense, so has a government the right to protect itself against revolution.

But it is purely academic to discuss such problems now. They were settled by the arbitrament of the sword, and out of the Civil War our Union of States was cemented together more closely than ever before.

I have often indulged the thought that if the people of the South before the Civil War had known the people of the North as they know them now, and if the people of the North before the Civil War had known the people of the South as they know them now, there would have been no war. And of this, too, I am perfectly clear: If there had been more Grants in the North and more Lees in the South these questions would have been settled without the shedding of a single drop of blood.

THE EARLY DAYS OF THE CIVIL WAR.

A few days after the firing upon Fort Sumter a meeting of the loyal citizens of Galena, Ill., was held and Captain Grant was made chairman of the meeting. He did not devote his time to grandiloquent talk. He was even then the soldier, the commander. Calling the meeting to order, he said, in substance:

Fellow citizens, this meeting is called to organize a company of volunteers to serve the State of Illinois. * * * Before calling upon you to become volunteers, I wish to state just what will be required of you. First of all, unquestioning obedience to your superior officers. The Army is not a picnicking party, nor is it an excursion. You will have hard fare. You may be obliged to sleep on the ground after long marches in the rain and snow. Many of the orders of your superiors will seem to you unjust, and yet they must be borne. If an injustice is really done you, however, there are courts-martial where your wrongs can be investigated and offenders punished. If you put your name down here it should be in full understanding of what the act means. In conclusion, let me say that so far as I can I will aid the company, and I intend to reenlist in the service myself.

This was the Grant whom the country later learned to know and love. His direct and straightforward statements as chairman of the Galena meeting were characteristic of his every thought and act during the entire period of the war.

The enlisted soldiers offered to make Grant captain of the company. He refused, stating that he thought he could serve the State better at Springfield. He tendered his services to Gov. Richard Yates, but the governor could find nothing for him to do. After some days he determined to go home. Governor Yates, learning of his intention, asked him to remain overnight and call at his office in the morning. Grant was assigned to a desk in the adjutant general's department doing clerical work. Grant was hoping for a command. He returned to Galena almost in despair because he did not receive suitable recognition of his military experience.

Mr. Houghton, the editor of a local paper, wrote concerning him:

We are now in want of just such soldiers as he is, and we hope the Government will invite him to higher command. He is the very soul of honor, and no man breathes who has a more patriotic heart. We want among our young soldiers the influence of the rare leadership of men like Captain Grant.

Grant was a newcomer in Illinois. Public men did not know him. Other men unfitted by training or experience were given positions in the organization of the State troops, but there seemed to be no place for Grant, the West Point cadet.

He went to Cincinnati and tendered his services to Gen. George B. McClellan, then in command of the military district. He met his old comrade, Carr B. White, in Georgetown, a member of the Ohio Legislature, and to him he related the circumstances and his ambition to serve in the Army. Mr. White replied that there ought to be a command for him, and said, "I am going to Columbus and I will see what I can do." In a few days he returned with a commission for Grant as colonel of the Twelfth Ohio, but meanwhile Governor Yates had wired him, asking him to accept the command of the Seventh District Regiment. This position he accepted, and it gave him his opportunity.

His regiment lacked in discipline and was said to be a "little unruly." When asked if he could manage them, his quiet reply was, "I think I can." When presented to his regiment by Colonel Goode, he said, after returning the salute of the adjutant: "A soldier's first duty is to learn to obey his commander. I shall expect my orders to be obeyed as exactly and instantly as if we were on the field of battle."

A little later, while at St. Louis, Grant received a telegram from his friend, Washburne, advising him that the President had appointed him as brigadier general of Volunteers.

In the brief space of time allotted to me it is, of course, impossible to go into all of the details of this wonderful commander's activities.

Grant was the one man above every other commanding officer in the West who seemed to have the military genius to bring order out of chaos, to convert raw recruits into trained veterans, and to inspire them with the bravery of spirit and love of country which was necessary to suppress the rebellion and preserve the Union.

Shortly after he had assumed command he found that the Confederates were marching onto the city of Paducah. On September 6, 1861, he issued this proclamation to its citizens:

I have come among you, not as an enemy but as your friend and fellow citizen, not to injure or annoy you but to respect the rights and defend and enforce the rights of all loyal citizens. An enemy in rebellion against our common Government has taken possession of and planted its guns upon the soil of Kentucky and fired upon our flag. Hickman and Columbus are in his hands; he is moving upon our city. I am here to defend you against this enemy, and to assert and maintain the authority and sovereignty of your Government and mine. I have nothing to do with opinions. I deal only with armed rebellion and its aiders and abettors. You can pursue your usual vocations without fear or hindrance. The strong arm of the Government is here to protect its friends and to punish only its enemies. Whenever it is manifest that you are able to defend yourselves, to maintain the authority of your Government and protect the rights of all its loyal citizens, I shall withdraw the forces under my command from your city.

Lincoln, later seeing this address, said, "The man who can write like that is fitted to command in the West."

He took Belmont. The Confederates held Columbus. In the midst of the fighting one of the Union officers shouted, "My God, we are surrounded." Grant replied, Grant-like, "We cut our way in and we can cut our way out."

He moved with vigor and precision. On February 5 he advanced against Fort Henry. On the day following it fell, and he telegraphed Halleck, "Fort Henry is ours," and added, "I shall take and destroy Fort Donelson on the 8th and return to Fort Henry."

Weather and other conditions, however, prevented his taking Fort Donelson as quickly as he thought, but he moved on to his objective with that persistence and determination which always carried him through every obstacle that came in his way. Generals Floyd, Pillow, and Buckner were in charge for the Confederates. Floyd and Pillow fled. General Buckner thought it useless to continue further fighting. He sent word to Grant, asking for terms of capitulation. Grant replied, "No terms except immediate and unconditional surrender can be accepted. I propose to move immediately upon your works."

Victory was now in the air. The North began to find itself. They had a general who could fight and win. He was little known either to the people of the North or the East. The whole Nation began to inquire, "Who is this man Grant, who fights battles and wins them?"

After Shiloh great pressure was begun to have the President remove Grant from his command in the west. But Lincoln, after full investigation, replied, "I can't spare Grant; he fights."

Shiloh was one of the most terrific battles in the West. An eminent writer, after reviewing this battle, says:

The Battle of Shiloh showed Ulysses Grant to be a commander of a new type. His personal habits in conflict were now apparent to all his staff. He did not shout, vituperate, or rush aimlessly to and fro. He had no vindictiveness. While other officers in the heat of battle swore and uttered ferocious cries, Grant voiced all his commands in plain Anglo-Saxon speech, without oaths or abridgment. His anxiety and intensity of mental action never passed beyond his perfect control. He fought best and thought best when pushed hard.

A man of singular gentleness, he had displayed the faculty which enables a man to consider soldiers en masse, to look over and beyond the destruction of human life in battle to the end for which the battle is fought. Unwilling to harm any living thing himself, he had the resolution to send columns of men into battle calmly and without hesitation. Without this constitution of mind no great commander can succeed.

Perhaps his next greatest achievement was the capture of Vicksburg. He laid siege to the city in the spring of 1863. It was a giant's task. The public began to lose faith in the hero of Donelson and Shiloh. Lincoln declared, "Even Washburne has deserted Grant." Charles A. Dana was sent to the front by the Secretary of War to report on the conditions of the Army. Later Gen. Lorenzo Thomas was sent with an order relieving Grant, if he should find it necessary. Commodore Porter told General Thomas that "if the news got out the boys would tar and feather him." The order was never delivered. The siege continued. He assumed all responsibility. He knew if he failed his reputation would be lost; if he won, it would greatly cripple and discourage the South and correspondingly encourage the North. The siege and the fighting continued. At last, on July 3, a white flag appeared on the Confederate works. The commanding general asked for commissioners to arrange terms of

surrender; and again Grant replied, "I have no terms other than unconditional surrender."

After some little negotiation terms were concluded. They were so liberal that they were criticized in the North; but at 10 o'clock on July 4 the besieged "marched out of their entrenchments. With sad faces the men of each regiment stacked their arms, threw down upon them knapsacks, belts, cartridges, and cap pouches, and then tenderly crowned the piles with their faded and riddled colors."

Thus ended the siege of Vicksburg.

Then followed Chattanooga and Missionary Ridge. As Grant rode along the lines he was recognized by the soldiers, and they cried, "Now we know we have a general."

The Assistant Secretary of War sent this message to Washington: "Glory to God, the day is decisively ours. Our men are frantic with joy and enthusiasm, and received Grant as he rode along the lines after the victory with tumultuous shouts."

The next day was Thanksgiving Day and all over the Nation grateful millions of people blessed the name of Grant.

These victories, like the finger of fate, pointed to Grant as the one man in America who ought to command the forces in the East against Lee.

Washburne offered a bill reviving the grade of lieutenant general. In speaking of Grant he said:

He has fought more battles and won more victories than any man living. He has captured more prisoners and taken more guns than any general of modern times.

The President signed the bill and nominated General Grant to be lieutenant general of the armies of the United States. This announcement was received with universal acclaim. The modest Grant on March 4, 1864, wrote to General Sherman, and spoke of the success which had met his efforts, and his place in the public confidence, but he did not take all the credit to himself. With his characteristic generosity of soul, he said:

No one feels more than I how much of this success is due to the skill and energy and the harmonious putting forth of that energy and skill of those whom it has been my good fortune to have occupying a subordinate position under me.

There are many officers to whom these remarks are applicable to a greater or less degree, proportionate to their ability as soldiers; but what I want is to express my thanks to you and McPherson as the men to whom, above all others, I feel indebted for whatever I have had of success. * * * I feel all the gratitude this letter can express, giving it the most flattering construction.

To this letter General Sherman replied, in part:

You do yourself injustice and us too much honor in assigning to us too large a share of the merits which have led to your high advancement. You are Washington's legitimate successor and occupy a place of almost dangerous elevation; but if you can continue, as heretofore, to be yourself, simple, honest, and unpretending, you will enjoy through life the respect and love of friends and the homage of millions of human beings that will award you a large share in securing them and their descendants a government of law and stability. * * *

I believe you are as brave, patriotic, and just as the great prototype Washington, as unselfish, kind-hearted, and honest as a man should be; but your chief characteristic is the simple faith in success you have always manifested, which I can liken to nothing else than the faith a Christian has in a Savior. This faith gave you victory at Shiloh and Vicksburg. Also, when you have completed your last preparations, you go into battle without hesitation, as at Chattanooga—no doubts, no reserves—and I tell you it was this that made us act with confidence.

No one doubts the great and commanding genius and patriotism of General Sherman. His devotion to General Grant, his commanding officer, is almost unparalleled in the history of warfare.

Sherman advised him not to stay in Washington. True, it was the Capital of the Nation, but it seemed to be full of intrigue and of political connivance which since the outbreak of the war had had its effect upon every commanding general who preceded Grant and often jeopardized the movements of the troops in the field.

After Grant had assumed control and had gone West to close up his work there and have a conference with General Sherman and other generals, he returned to the East and pitched his tent in the fields with his armies. He was not given to ostentation and display. He went straight to his headquarters at Culpeper. He announced, "There will be no grand review and no show business."

Grant had work to do. He was commander of all of the forces of the North. "The far-flung" battle line of the northern forces was more than 1,000 miles in length. The Army was, to use Sherman's words, "a unit now in action." He kept his own counsel. The Army of the Potomac was moved with the same untiring vigor and energy, with the same clear intelligence and precision with which he commanded the forces in the West and brought victory to our colors. He was pitted against the greatest military genius in the Southern Confederacy. Neither Grant nor Lee underestimated one another. Greek had met Greek. But Grant was fighting a winning cause—Lee a losing cause.

The Army of the Potomac was well trained, but it had not been well led. Grant removed some officers. He placed others. Lincoln had implicit confidence in him. He did not interfere with Grant's action in the field.

At this time a correspondent writes of him:

Grant is not intoxicated with flattery. * * * I never met with a man of so much simplicity, shyness, and decision. He has lost nothing of his freshness of mind. He avoids Washington and its corrupting allurements. He is essentially a soldier of the camp and field. All his predecessors were ruined by Washington influences. He has established his headquarters 10 miles nearer the enemy than Meade. His tents are almost among the soldiers. That is a western and not a Potomac Army custom. He travels with the simplicity of a second lieutenant, with a small trunk, which he often forgets and goes off without. If Grant falls, then a curse is on this Army. He is a soldier to the core, a genuine commoner, commander of a democratic army from a democratic people. * * * From what I learn of him, he is no more afraid to take the responsibility of a million men than of a single company.

Up until Grant became lieutenant general and took charge of the armies in the field our forces, whether east or west, seemed to act without system, without unity of purpose. The officers in the field were partly responsible for this condition. But the Congress and the War Department at Washington must bear their share of the responsibility. Grant demanded of President Lincoln the assurance that the War Department would cease to command in the field.

On arriving in Washington he made up his mind to say to Lincoln: "I will accept the command of the Armies of the United States, provided I can be free from the interference of the War Department; otherwise I shall be obliged to decline the honor." But this was not necessary. Lincoln knew all too well the defects in his fighting machine.

The President, in presenting him with his commission as lieutenant general, said:

The Nation's appreciation of what you have done and its reliance upon you for what remains to be done in the existing great struggle are now presented with this commission constituting you lieutenant general in the Army of the United States. With this high honor devolves upon you also a corresponding responsibility. As the country herein trusts you, so, under God, it will sustain you. I scarcely need to add that with what I here speak goes my own hearty concurrence.

General Grant replied:

I accept the commission with gratitude for the high honor conferred. With the aid of the noble armies that have fought in so many fields for our common country, it will be my earnest endeavor not to disappoint your expectations. I feel the full weight of the responsibilities now devolving upon me, and I know that if they are met it will be due to those armies and, above all, to the favor of that Providence which leads both nations and men.

Other great generals had preceded him in commanding the Army of the Potomac. Many of them were men of great ability, brave in action, brilliant in achievement, but none of them had to their credit as many or as great victories as Grant had won in the West.

Reserved of manner, plain of dress, and soft of speech, he was not at home in the social whirl of Washington. His place was in the camp or on the battle field. There he was master of men and of measures—quick to conceive and quick to act. Entire battle fields were spread before him like a panorama. He knew what to do and when to do it. To think was to execute. His great brain worked like a Corliss engine.

After Grant's appointment as lieutenant general he returned to Nashville for a conference with Sherman, promising to return to Washington within nine days from the date of his leaving.

Upon his return Lincoln said to him:

I have never professed to be a military man, nor to know how campaigns should be conducted, and never wanted to interfere in them. But procrastination on the part of generals and the pressure of the people at the North, and of Congress, which is always with me, have forced me into issuing a series of military orders. I don't know but they were all wrong, and I'm pretty certain some of them were. All I wanted or ever wanted is some one to take the responsibility and act—and call on me for all assistance needed. I pledge myself to use all the power of government in rendering such assistance.

Grant replied:

I will do the best I can, Mr. President, with the means at hand.

Later Lincoln said in reply to a question:

I don't know General Grant's plans, and I don't want to know them. Thank God, I've got a general at last.

From the hour Grant assumed command of the Army of the Potomac a new spirit had been breathed into it. They knew they had a leader, and they knew that proper leadership was the one essential for complete victory.

The South, too, began to realize that a new man was at the helm. A southern editor gave this warning:

Grant is a determined man, and has a tremendous force under his hand, and we may rest assured that when he is beaten it will be only when the last capacity for fight has been taken out of him and his army. Until this is done our generals, army, and government should brace every nerve, stretch every sinew, force nature, and yield nothing to fatigue.

The South began its preparations for the last and final struggle. All men between 17 and 50 were called. Grant, in referring to this call, said the South was "robbing the cradle and the grave."

Grant was confident of final victory, but he knew the bravery and the spirit of his foe, and he did not underestimate either. In the great Battle of the Wilderness the two armies met in deathlike struggle. It was a long, a bloody battle. No man who survived it on either side, whether officer or private, ever lost his admiration for the courage of his foe.

Grant had supreme confidence in his men as well as his generals. To illustrate: During this terrific battle an excited orderly cried out, "They have broken through. Hancock has given way." Grant replied, "I do not believe it." He knew Hancock.

For days the tide of battle ebbed and flowed. Lee had failed to break the line or check the advance. At one time he was told Grant was retreating. "You are mistaken," Lee replied; "quite mistaken. Grant is not a retreating man."

After three days of fighting, Grant wrote: "The results of the three days' fighting are in our favor. I shall take no backward steps." And later he wrote to General Halleck, "I propose to fight it out on this line if it takes all summer."

The spirit of the men was equalled only by that of the commanding general. A historian tells us that at a critical period in the battle a part of the Union forces began to feel that they were again whipped by Lee. They feared another retreat would be sounded. But the orders were given. The march was forward. The men broke out with this refrain:

Ulysses leads the van!
For we will dare
To follow where
Ulysses leads the van.

After Grant established his headquarters at Culpeper, Virginia became the great battle field of the war. The struggle was gigantic. Not one, but many battles were fought. The slaughter was unparalleled in the history of our warfare. The world shuddered at the fratricidal contest. Union and the freedom of the race were in the balance. Grant knew that the cause must be won or lost in Virginia. Fair-minded men can not say whether the soldiers of the North or of the South fought with the greater valor or under the more brilliant leadership. Determination to win characterized both armies. For a time only the God of battles knew where success would lie. But Lincoln and Grant, their generals and their soldiers, aye, the entire North kept up their courage and did not falter. The superior strength and resources of the North were destined to win.

As I read the history of this struggle, no one battle decided the contest. It was a succession of battles, characterized by masterly generalship and a courageous soldiery. Who, whether he be of the North or of the South, does not recall with pride the heroism in the Wilderness, at Spottsylvania, at Cold Harbor, at Petersburg, at Appomattox, or in many another battle of perhaps less importance, but fought with the same spirit of heroism?

Grant's genius for command seemed to grow as the occasion demanded. True, he did not escape criticism, aye, virulent abuse; but what great man who served his country ever has? The greater his victories and the more battles he won, the more shafts of slander were hurled at him. He must have been stung to the quick, for he was a very sensitive man. But criticism, cruel and unjust as it was, never swerved him from his path of duty. He saw beyond the smoke of battle the glory of the country reunited and human slavery forever wiped out.

As this terrific contest progressed, the critics became more severe in denunciation. They called him "butcher"; and it must be admitted that blood flowed freely on both sides of the battle line. But great battles were never won without bloodshed. Carping critics never fought a battle, much less won a war. Of course they do not shed blood, because they do not fight battles with the sword. They never assault the enemy. They fight their friends from behind, and they fight them from afar off. Their swords are their pens and their tongues. Occasionally some of them are wounded, but they are not wounded in the front while facing and advancing upon the enemy. Their wounds are in their backs while running from danger.

During the fighting in Virginia he said in reply to his critics:

I am commanding an army. The business of an army is to fight. This is war. I am determined to whip out the rebellion. There is no other way. I am pursuing the same policy which I began at Belmont. It is my intention to fight.

Again, after he had been twice unanimously nominated for the Presidency by his party, and after he had been twice elected by overwhelming majorities, during his second inaugural

address he referred with dignity to the abuse which had been heaped upon him in these words:

I did not ask for place or position, and was entirely without influence or the acquaintance of persons of influence. But I was resolved to perform my part in a struggle threatening the very existence of the Union. I performed a conscientious duty without asking promotion or command. Notwithstanding this, throughout the war and from my candidacy for my present position in 1868, I have been the subject of abuse and slander scarcely ever equaled in political history, which yet to-day I feel I can afford to disregard in view of your verdict, which I gratefully accept as my vindication.

No man among our dead, save Washington and Lincoln, has been more greatly vilified than Grant, but like Washington and Lincoln, Grant will live long after his traducers shall have faded from the memory of man.

Grant, like many people of the North, did not believe the war would last long. Neither did the people of the South. Before the actual fighting began Grant thought with Seward the rebellion would be suppressed in 90 days. This must have been the thought of Lincoln himself, because his first call for troops was for 90 days.

The people in the North did not think the South would fight.

The people of the South were certain the North would not fight. Orators in the South spoke of the northerners as cowards—claimed that one southern man was equal to five northern men in battle, and if the South would stand up for its rights the North would back down.

Jefferson Davis said in a speech, "He would agree to drink all of the blood spilled south of the Mason and Dixon line if there should be a war." Too bad they did not know one another better. Neither side appreciated the valor, the spirit, the worth of the other.

What a tribute the history of the Civil War is to the fine courage of the people of both North and South! The people of both sections were sprung from the same loins. They were all all-American.

WAS GRANT AN ACCIDENT?

Many who knew Grant in his youth and early manhood before and even during the Civil War had little confidence in his ability or fitness for high command. Some who knew him intimately referred to him as a mere "accident." Such criticisms hurt, but they did not unmake the man.

The God of battles does not choose great commanders of great armies by accident. Accidents are not placed in the niches of the temple of fame. Maybe that occasionally, by some fortuitous combination of circumstances, an inferior man may win where a superior man may lose. Accident may win a battle. It never won a magnificent series of battles. It never won a war. Ulysses Simpson Grant did both.

Accident did not win commendation from his superior officers for bravery on the battle fields of Mexico or for ability as quartermaster.

Accident was not in the saddle at Belmont, or Fort Thomas, or Fort Donelson, or Shiloh, or Vicksburg, or Chattanooga in the west.

Accident did not make Grant commander in chief of the armies in the field. It did not win in the Wilderness or at Spotsylvania or at Petersburg or at Appomattox.

Had he been an accident he could not have had the sustained confidence and the continued loyal devotion of the Shermans, the Sheridans, the McPhersons, and the Meades. Accident did not tie his faithful soldiery to him by hooks of steel.

Accident did not win for him two nominations and two elections to the Presidency of the Republic.

No; Grant was not an accident. He was the one man born from the womb of time to lead our armies to victory and to restore the Union, never again to be dissolved. Like Minerva, he sprung full fledged from the head of Jove. He was born to command. Lincoln discovered him. He won where others failed.

Great as Grant was on the battle field, he was greater at the peace table. Determined and tenacious in conflict, he was magnanimous in victory. Nothing finer appears in all history than his treatment of Lee and his armies at Appomattox. He required all arms, artillery, and public property to be parked and stacked and turned over to the officer appointed by him to receive them. This did not embrace either the side arms of the officers or their private horses or baggage. This done, each officer and man was allowed to return to his home, "not to be disturbed by the United States authorities so long as they observe their parole and the laws in force where they reside."

Lee was surprised at the generosity of Grant's proposal, and added, "this will have a most happy effect upon my army."

What a temptation it would have been to mahy a general to have demanded terms both exacting and humiliating! Not so with Grant. Now that the war had been won, his one thought was to win the peace.

Later on came Lincoln's assassination and Andrew Johnson's succession to the Presidency. He proposed "to make treason odious." He sought to have Lee and other leading southerners indicted for treason. General Lee appealed to Grant, saying he had learned that he was to be indicted for treason by the grand jury at Norfolk. He adds:

I had supposed that the officers and men of the Army of Northern Virginia were by the terms of the surrender protected by the United States Government from molestation so long as they conformed to its conditions. * * *

Grant wrote to the Secretary of War with firmness and magnanimity:

In my opinion the officers and men paroled at Appomattox Courthouse, and since upon the same terms given to Lee, can not be tried for treason so long as they observe the terms of their parole. This is my understanding. Good faith as well as true policy dictates that we should observe the conditions of that convention. Bad faith on the part of the Government or a construction of that convention subjecting the officers to trial for treason would produce a feeling of insecurity in the minds of all paroled officers and men. * * *

He wrote to Lee:

I have forwarded your application for amnesty and pardon to the President with the following indorsement: "Respectfully forwarded, through the Secretary of War, to the President, with the earnest recommendation that this application of Gen. R. E. Lee for amnesty and pardon be granted him."

General Grant was not content with a mere protest. He said to the President, "The people of the North do not wish to inflict torture upon the people of the South."

President Johnson answered, "I will make treason odious. When can these men be tried?"

Grant replied, "Never, never; unless they violate their parole."

Grant was determined that the Government should keep the faith, and he finally won. From this time on his every thought and every act looked to the healing of the wounds of war. He wanted the sections reunited in fact and in spirit as well as in name.

When, after his first nomination as a candidate for the Presidency he wrote his letter of acceptance, this same thought was uppermost in his mind, and after his letter had been completed he added these four words:

Let us have peace.

It was not in his heart after victory to trample the people of the South under the iron heel of war. Rather he looked upon them as wayward brothers, whom he wanted to bring back to the protecting folds of our glorious flag.

How well he succeeded the reestablished Union proclaims to the world for all time. Peace to the ashes of Ohio's greatest son. May we honor ourselves by writing his name large upon the tablets of our memories.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10101) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to certain amendments of the Senate, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 132) to provide for the continuance of certain Government publications, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KIESS, Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, and Mr. STEVENSON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed enrolled bills of the following titles, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 2186. An act granting certain lands in Hot Springs, Ark., to the Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital Association; and

H. R. 10007. An act for the relief of certain persons to whom, or their predecessors, patents were issued to public lands in the State of Minnesota under an erroneous survey made in 1876.

GREGORIE SEMENOFF AND BORIS BAKHMETEFF.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator in charge of the tariff bill [Mr. McCUMBER] that I shall be as brief as possible, because I do not want to be unnecessarily in the way of the consideration of that bill.

One Gregorie Semenoff has been permitted to enter this country. It has been a little difficult to analyze the influences which enabled him to come into the United States. It is quite apparent to me that the Department of Labor was not anxious to have him come. I think the hearings and the report now printed will disclose that fact. Nevertheless, he was permitted to enter. At this time I do not propose to discuss the question of how he came to be permitted to come into the United States.

Semenoff has been characterized by the officers of the American Army and the American soldiers in Siberia as a bandit, a murderer, one who attacked American soldiers without any cause, and at a time when we were supposed to be on friendly relations, resulting in the death of two and the wounding of a number. All these facts, Mr. President, were well known to the department here and were presented to the officers on the coast who admitted him into this country.

I am going to call attention briefly to some of this testimony which has been taken, as it states the case against Semenoff much more effectively than I could do in my own language.

General Graves, who had charge of the Siberian expedition, so far as the American forces were concerned, in his testimony said:

The next real incident that I had, so far as American troops were concerned, one of Semenoff's generals, on an armored car, on the nights of January 9 and 10 went to Posolskaya, arriving there about 1 o'clock in the morning, and opened fire on a box car loaded with American soldiers, this car being used as quarters for the American soldiers in the performance of their duty guarding the railroad under the railroad agreement. Two American soldiers were killed and one wounded, as I remember the case. The American soldiers got out of the car and punctured the locomotive with rifle bullets, and after the train got about 5 or 6 versts from there it could not go any further, and they succeeded in capturing the general, 5 officers, and 48 men that were on that train.

Further he said:

When we returned from Omsk in the latter part of August, 1919, as we passed through the town of Adrianovka, which is some 100 or 200 miles from the Manchurian line, one of the American railroad service corps men, named McDonald, related to me an incident of Semenoff's murdering. That incident was taken down at the time as given by Lieutenant McDonald. This was taken down by my aid, Captain Hoffman, and I have here that statement as made by Lieutenant McDonald. If there is no objection, I would prefer to read the statement as taken down at the time or I can give it as I remember it.

Then he read the statement, which was afterwards incorporated in the record. A part of that statement is as follows:

I had long heard of these big killings that Semenoff was having at different points along the line of the railroad, but I really couldn't believe it. It didn't seem possible that such things could be true, even here in Siberia, so I said to myself that it was just some more Russian lies. One day I went down to Adrianovka. I arrived there the evening of the 18th of August. Lieutenants McNutt and Griggs, of the Russian corps, were there, and they told me of the killing of Bolshevik prisoners. They said that that day they had tramped over a large part of the country a verst or two east of Adrianovka trying to locate the place of the killing, but hadn't found anything. They said that there was a train in the yards with about 400 prisoners in cars and that indications were that there would be a killing in the next day or two.

I knew the stories about Macavievo, and I knew they handled the prisoners rough. One morning I had seen a prison train with two cars filled with women—one box car and regular prison car. As I was going by an old woman looked out between the bars and hailed me. Then she called a young girl up to the window, a sick-looking, red-haired girl, who spoke to me in very good English. I asked her where she was going and she answered, "I only wish I knew." The train pulled out almost immediately, and I could not find out more.

Just the same I found it hard to believe they were as bad as the stories made out. Early next morning, however—that was the 19th—we saw a bunch of Semenoff's soldiers walking in from the east, carrying long-handled shovels. The boys—I mean Lieutenants McNutt and Griggs—said they had seen the same kind of a gang come in previous to other killings.

Shortly afterwards we saw them loading soldiers on the prisoners' train, and taking a machine gun from an armored car that was standing there and putting it on the train. They took 10 carloads—about half—of the prisoners and started east from the yards. They left at 9.50.

It was then I decided to find out what I could about the killing, so I footed it east after them. About 2 versts out, I finally came in sight of the train (I call it the murder train) standing near a curve of the railway. I kept on, hoping to reach the place, but was stopped by a guard. I was then about a hundred yards from the train, but because of the topography of the country I couldn't see anything of the soldiers or the prisoners. I pretended not to understand Russian when the guard stopped me, but he put a shell into his rifle to assist my understanding. I understood. I knew I was near where the killing had been, but I wasn't quite sure when I walked away whether I'd get one from the guard or not.

I had only been back from the station a few minutes when that train came back empty. It had gone out full. It had been gone just 1 hour and 55 minutes. I noticed they had not brought the machine gun back. By the way, Stepanoff, Semenoff's colonel in charge, just as the first batch was leaving, went out and got a rifle for himself. There were Kolchak guards on the train, for they had on British uniforms. The second train was gone 1 hour and 50 minutes and brought the machine gun back with it.

I didn't go out again that day, but the next morning McNutt and Griggs and I, three of us, went out. On the way we met a peasant woman carrying boots and socks and clothing. At the place where the train had been standing the day before, we saw that the roadbed had marks of a large number of people getting off and moving about. The ground was littered with torn clothing, worn-out puttees, and papers of

all kinds, including a bolshevik ruble note. Just a short distance from the track—about 15 feet—we found one body shot through the lower jaw, left, and through the cheek. Thirty feet farther on we found another body. The weeds and ground near the bodies seemed to indicate struggles. The poor devils had evidently tried to escape. We walked on toward some mounds of fresh earth we saw, and found three large holes, two filled up and covered over, and one only about half filled with just a little covering of earth over the bodies. I picked up several shells at the edge of the third grave, of two different calibers, partly a large caliber, but mostly of a smaller one. There was nothing to indicate what they were or where they were made. A short distance eastward, possibly a hundred yards from the three holes, we found another that had evidently been there much longer. It was filled, but there was such a thin layer of earth on top that dogs or other animals had dragged some of the bodies out. Some had the feet cut off, one had no head, one had the genitals cut off. Of course, dogs might have done it, but didn't look like the work of dogs. At another hole we found just the trunk of a body lying on some fresh earth. It was all black and ugly.

It had been raining for some time, so we turned and went back to Adrianovka. It rained all the next day, but the day after that it cleared up in the afternoon. So at about 5 o'clock I went out with my camera to see if I could not get some pictures for evidence. The other boys didn't come with me; they had had enough. When I got there I found that the bodies had been buried. There were some little boys there digging around after loot, and they told me that the section hands of the railroad had done the burying. The boys showed me where six other bodies had been found on the other side of the tracks—shot evidently when they were trying to escape. It seemed to me that the big killing had been done by lining the prisoners up along the edge of the bank and firing at them catamored across it. An old peasant woman that lived near by told me that they had to give up getting in their grain because of the stench. I told her they'd better get gas masks and go to it; they might need the grain. But I didn't get any pictures.

That same night Semenoff went through on his way east. There were a number of Japanese on the train and some women. They stopped at Adrianovka and had a celebration—a big banquet. Stepanoff was there. They had music and plenty of booze. Then Semenoff went east to Vladivostok.

This is the statement—

Says General Graves—

of John J. McDonald, lieutenant in the railway service corps at Chita on Monday, September 1, 1919.

Mr. Clark, interrogating General Graves on behalf of Semenoff, asked:

Did you take up with General Semenoff that incident which you mentioned of the slaughter ground, which you have read from that account there, when General Semenoff went through the next day?

General GRAVES. I did not. I would have no dealings with that man that day or any day.

Mr. CLARK. Then, you had no personal knowledge as to the claim that Semenoff was in no way responsible for it?

Colonel GRAVES. I know nothing about it except that it was in his territory.

Mr. CLARK. Who was in supreme command of the eastern republic at that time? Was that under the Kolchak régime?

General GRAVES. Kolchak was at Omsk at that time and it was prior to his being killed.

Mr. CLARK. Who was in supreme command?

General GRAVES. The conditions over there are such that I think rather than answer that definitely, some explanation is necessary. While Kolchak was supposed to be in supreme command, it was generally thought that he was not in a position to control Semenoff, Kalmykoff, or Rozanoff.

Mr. CLARK. In the structure of the governmental system there, de facto or de jure at that time, Kolchak was at the head of the organization, was he not?

General GRAVES. I could not say that Kolchak was at the head of Semenoff. Semenoff at that time had, I think, recognized Kolchak. Part of the time he recognized Kolchak and part of the time he did not.

Again:

Mr. CLARK. As to the incident to which you have referred, of the shooting upon a box car with American soldiers upon it, there was subsequently an investigation made of that, was there not?

General GRAVES. There was.

Mr. CLARK. By whom?

General GRAVES. By Colonel Morrow.

Mr. CLARK. By whom on behalf of the Russians?

General GRAVES. I do not know.

Mr. CLARK. Do you not know that there was an investigation?

General GRAVES. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Do you know the result of that investigation?

General GRAVES. I do.

Mr. CLARK. What was it?

General GRAVES. So far as we are concerned, nothing.

Mr. CLARK. Do you know what discipline was meted out?

General GRAVES. I do not. My judgment is that nothing was, because Semenoff made no expression of regret to me as the commander of the American forces, and took no action prior to departure of American troops which led me to believe that he was in the least regretful of the incident. As these were men under him, and as I was commander of the American Expeditionary Forces, if he did not approve of it I should have thought he certainly would have expressed regret to the American commander.

I call attention now briefly to the statement of Colonel Morrow, who had command of the American troops. He said:

On the night of January 10 four armored trains had passed through. This was on the night of the 10th of January, 1920. The fifth armored train, the "Destroyer," came through and stopped at Verkhne Udinsk, which was the town which I was in command of. They arrested the station master, robbing him of all of his property, including all the clothing of his wife, broke up the furniture in his house, and took him aboard the "Destroyer." I was informed of this by my provost marshal in the city.

I at once went aboard the "Destroyer" with an interpreter and my adjutant, and interviewed the general in command of the train, General Bogomoletz. He informed me that he had arrested the station master at Verkhne Udinsk, and proposed to kill him. I told General Bogomoletz that his train was passing through the American sector on sufferance, and that he could not arrest men in the American sector and execute

them. General Bogomoletz replied that he was not responsible to me and would do as he pleased, and that the conversation was at a close. I informed General Bogomoletz that the conversation was just beginning, and if he did not release the station master I would forcibly take him away from him with American troops.

After a rather heated argument General Bogomoletz released the station master, making the station master sign a statement that he had received back all of his property. He had not received back any of his property. This was about 7 o'clock.

The armored train, "Destroyer," then moved out of Verkhne Udinsk and went to the station Posolskaya, about 60 miles from there.

A lieutenant named Paul Kendall was posted at Posolskaya with a detachment of 38 men. They were sleeping in box cars. The armored train, "Destroyer," moved into Posolskaya and took aboard the Russian Captain Krisko there, moved back from the American box cars, and opened fire. This was between 12 and 1 o'clock at night. It was about 40 or 50 degrees below zero and there was about 8 inches of snow on the ground.

Kendall and his men turned out with hand grenades and rifles and began the battle against the armored train. They threw a hand grenade into the engine, very seriously damaging it, so that it could only move down the track about 5 versts. Here Captain Ramsay closed in on it from the east, and the armored train was captured in the morning.

Mr. STERLING. From whose testimony is the Senator reading?

Mr. BORAH. From the testimony of Colonel Morrow. He continues:

During the fighting that occurred Sergeant Robins was killed, Private Montgomery died later of wounds, and Private Towney was knocked from the armored train when he attempted to board it, and his foot was cut off.

The CHAIRMAN. When were these men killed, with reference to the first attack?

Colonel Morrow. Right in the first fighting.

Continuing, Colonel Morrow says:

General Bogomoletz and his officers and men were brought under guard and placed in the guardhouse by my command. I at once notified Ataman Semenov of the actions of this car, and requested the immediate trial of Bogomoletz and his officers. I recited to him the crimes of General Bogomoletz and begged him for immediate trial of these officers. I continued to receive from Semenov evasive telegrams, which would lead nowhere. I was under order with my command to evacuate Siberia immediately. Of this fact I informed Ataman Semenov.

Further, Colonel Morrow says:

While the men of Bogomoletz's train were under my command I caused Lieutenant Colonel Gillem to take their testimony. I propose to read the testimony of Asst. Surg. Michael Morosoff, who was aboard this armored train. This testimony was taken by Lieutenant Colonel Gillem, Jr., of the Twenty-seventh Infantry. [Reading:]

"1. Q. How long have you been of the bronevick?—A. Since September, 1919.

"2. Q. Have you got a family?—A. A wife and a child. I was forced to work on the bronevick; I wanted to commit suicide because I couldn't stand the horrors of Semenov's men.

"3. Q. Did you see any Americans at Station Posolskaya?—A. No; I was asleep at the time. Friends say that the bronevick fired first.

"4. Q. What did the bronevick do after the fighting?—A. The engine couldn't go at full speed, so it backed up slowly about 3 versts and stopped.

"5. Q. Why do the people call the bronevick 'destroyer' not only in name but also in action?

"6. Q. How many executions did you see at station Oloviannaya?—A. Fifteen men and one woman were taken into the car and whipped, then taken to the ice hole and killed one after another. In most cases they were lashed and hit with the bayonets and then thrown in the ice hole half alive. All took place January 1, 1920.

"At the last trip from Chita to Verkhne Udinsk there were killed about 40 men only because they were suspected of helping Bolsheviks.

"At the same expedition one woman was killed after she wouldn't give herself up to the military commandant of the station. All these cases can be verified, as the bodies were never buried.

"All executions were committed by order of the general himself, because it was a punitive expedition.

"The provodnik of the general's car was so badly whipped that he died two days ago.

"The general had mercy for nobody. He was also the only judge.

"Before his service on the bronevick he worked on Station Adrianova, and took part in executions of one group of Bolsheviks, 370 men, and small groups of 15 and 20 men.

"Everybody on the bronevick knows very well that the general would continue his executions up to Irkutsk. My opinion that the most men killed were peasants who knew nothing about politics.

"7. Q. Did the men like the service on the bronevick?—A. About six did. The rest were forced to do it. For the least offense people were whipped and killed. One man tried to leave the bronevick at Manchuria. He was caught and whipped. He died two days later.

"MICHAEL MOROSOFF."

Mr. BORAH. On page 19 of the printed record, Colonel Morrow says:

In December General Semenov sent General Levitsky, with what was known as the Wild Division, to Verkhne Udinsk. That division consisted of about 2,000 Mongolians, mounted on Mongolian ponies and camels, and about 500 Cossacks.

Shortly after his arrival General Levitsky began sending detachments into the Selenga Valley.

This valley, as we were informed, is a large valley, having a population of about 1,000,000, who at that time, according to the statement of Colonel Morrow, were not active either in war activities or political activities. They were a quiet, inoffensive, law-abiding people—the Russian peasantry disturbing no one and taking no side in the conflict.

These detachments committed robbery and plunder and murder and crimes unspeakable. The peasants finally rose up and fought these detachments, defeating some of the smaller detachments.

In January General Levitsky took the field at the head of his forces and made a cavalry raid into the valley of the Selenga. He had no

sooner started his raid than two or three applications every day from Russian peasants began to come to the American headquarters, begging for help and assistance against Semenov's Wild Division. They also brought written petitions. I took down some of their statements, and some I kept. Many of them I lost.

To show the character of the operations of General Levitsky's command, I will read some of these signed statements.

The following is one of the statements addressed to the American forces:

VILLAGE SHERALDAI, January 3, 1920.

FRIENDS, AMERICANS: The people implore your help and request you to protect them from Semenov's Wild Division, who burn villages, bread, and the property of the peasants; who kill old men, women, and children, and who have mercy on no one.

We beg you to help us for the sake of the babies and old men. Have mercy and help us. Upon your arrival, you can be convinced by your own eyes of the true facts, through seeing the remnants and ashes of our homes.

(Signed by 38 peasants.)

Senator STERLING asked Colonel Morrow this question:

I suppose, Colonel, you felt that you were not authorized to give the relief that was asked for?

Colonel MORROW. Not at that time.

Senator STERLING. Your business was to guard the railroad?

Colonel MORROW. My business was to guard the railroad. I did assist the people of that country finally. I was forced to do it. I could not help it. I helped them in every way that it was possible for me to help them, except to take the field myself against General Levitsky.

Another statement read by Colonel Morrow is as follows:

VERKHNE UDINSK, January 18, 1920.

On the 10th of January the Wild Division, commanded by General Levitsky, passed through the village of Bobkina, perpetrating there about 15 murders upon the people without arms.

The 18th of January, the former American vice consul at Chita, Mr. Fowler, and Lieutenant Davis, of the American Army; Lieutenant Fuji and Captain Keda, of the Japanese Army; Maj. Doctor Marand and Major De Latier de Jean, of the French Army, went to this very village and were there able to make the following observations:

A dozen corpses, with the hands cut off, were lying heaped up in a pile half destroyed, all the bodies more or less cut up by saber wounds. The greater part bore many wounds made while living by saber blows, particularly on the face and back. All the corpses were burned. Many bore evident traces of having been burned while still living. From this last observation it must be admitted that the greater part, severely wounded only, must have died of asphyxiation, as an inspection of the wounds shows not one was immediately mortal.

After the departure of the criminals the people of the village, attracted by the smoke, were able to recover the corpses before complete burning up, which act has permitted the very precise preceding observations to be made.

About 15 meters from this place, in a large space still stained by blood on the snow, we found the bloody remains of burned hair and a large piece of a scalp, cut by a saber blow.

FWOWER, United States Vice Consul.

E. DAVIS, United States Army.

FUJI, Japanese Army.

KODA, Japanese Army.

D. MARAND, French Army.

C. DE LATIER DE JEAN, French Army.

I read now from an official report to Colonel Morrow by one of his officers:

8. August 19, 1919, at 2 a. m., on this date a train of 52 cars of prisoners arrived at Adrianovka from the west. This train left Chita, (1) with 41 cars, picked up 8 cars at Chita; (2) 1 car at Atamanovka, 1 car at Makavayev, and 1 car at Karemskaya. We knew there was to be a big killing, as the day previous there had been about 40 or 50 men, prisoners, digging four large holes out in the slaughter yard. These men had been prisoners for some time; that is, we always had from 1 to 4 or 5 cars of prisoners at Adrianovka all the time.

At 9.30 a. m. the yard engine took 29 cars of prisoners to the yard. The cars were covered with soldiers and a machine gun mounted on both ends of the train. Lieutenant McDonald and myself started to walk out to the yards, following the railway line.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What is the Senator reading from?

Mr. BORAH. I am reading from a report of Colonel Morrow.

Mr. STERLING. On what page?

Mr. BORAH. Page 22.

About one-half verst from where the train stopped we were stopped by a guard; we gave him 1,000 rubles and he allowed us to proceed. We soon ran into a stronger guard—three soldiers—who refused to accept money, and we were unable to get closer. We were, however, then within sight of the train and saw them unload the cars, two cars at a time, and start the prisoners over toward the holes. The holes were not within our sight, being located about 300 yards from the track in a small spot almost completely surrounded by hills.

I want it to be borne in mind that these were not prisoners taken in war, taken as a result of conflict or as a result of fighting. They were people who were picked up in different parts of the country—unarmed, helpless, defenseless men, women, and children, old and young. There is nothing in the history of the world equal to the brutality of this man who is now in this country.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, what excuse was there for this? Why were they being killed? Just out of bloodthirstiness?

Mr. BORAH. The only excuse which a humane person like the Senator or myself could conceive of is that it was just total, unmitigated, indescribable depravity. It would seem, however, that Semenov had the idea of terrorizing the country so as to bring it completely within his control and domination and estab-

lish himself as the ruler of that particular portion of the country. Whatever the reason was, or whatever reason could be assigned, the fact that it occurred can not be doubted. It is inexplicable. I had not supposed such monsters were left on earth. Indeed, I do not think such depravity is anywhere recorded in ancient or modern history.

The 29 cars, empties, were brought back to Adrianovka at 11.55 a. m. At 1.15 p. m. the other 23 cars were taken out.

They simply hauled these poor people out there like cattle are hauled to a slaughter pit. We have photographs of these scenes. They jammed them and crowded them into the cars like dumb beasts, drove them to the slaughter pit, shot them down, pushed them into these holes which had been dug, and left them there half covered for wild animals to prey upon.

I asked Colonel Stephanoft, about 9.15 a. m., if I might be allowed to go out with him, and he said yes, but not on the first trip, and requested that I wait until the second trip. When the train was ready the second time I got on with him on the platform of a brake car, but after the train started he told me to get off.

He had often told me he would take me out with him, and when he requested I get off this train he said wait until some other time.

He himself took a rifle with him on both these trips. August 19, new-style calendar, is a big Russian holiday. Colonel Stephanoft told me in the evening that he had enjoyed it, more so than ever.

I will state in this connection that a car of prisoners generally consisted of from 30 to 35 prisoners, and there were 53 of those cars. [Continuing reading:]

9. August 20 Lieutenant McDonald and myself walked down the track to the "yard."

That is, to the slaughter yard, which was as well known in that country as the slaughter pens of Chicago belonging to the packers are known here.

We found dead bodies scattered along the track for a distance of about half a verst east of the yard, from there clear up to the holes. They were on both sides of the track. From the point where the cars were stopped over to the holes they were the thickest. We took 18 different pictures of what we saw, all except one of which were later destroyed by a Semenov officer in a photograph shop in Chita. I more correctly should have said confiscated instead of destroyed.

Senator STERLING. Were these persons, or any of them, people who had been taken in arms against Semenov's authority?

Colonel MORROW. I do not believe it, from what I knew of the country. [Continuing reading:]

10. August 31, Sunday, at 8.30 a. m., this date, a train of 41 cars of Bolshevik prisoners arrived Adrianovka from west en route east under Kolchak guard. Colonel Stephanoft ordered station master to cut out 10 cars at Adrianovka for him. The guard in charge of train refused to allow this to be done.

There seemed to be a kind of competition among those people about who should participate in the killing. It was an honor which their satanic souls competed for.

There was no recourse for the Kolchak guard, and he was forced to turn over the 10 cars. They were taken out to slaughter yard at 1.15 p. m. and killed. Colonel Stephanoft remarked he had to show the people of Adrianovka that he could execute on Sunday as well as on other days.

These murders were not wholly confined to Adrianovka Station, but were carried on over our entire district. Makaveyev Station, about 30 versts east from Chita, was another well-known place. When I first arrived at Mogzon the people were afraid to hear the names of Makaveyev and Adrianovka.

I do not want to trespass too long upon the time of the Senate by reading this; but in order to get at least a skeleton of the hideous story into the RECORD I will read a little further.

Mr. Clark asked Colonel Morrow:

Have you never seen the report of Consul General Harris on that? Colonel Morrow. I have not.

This is in regard to what was supposed to have been a punishment of Ataman Kalmykoff and some of those who were responsible for this killing. Colonel Morrow says:

I have not. Neither would I believe the report if I saw it, to that effect—

That is, to the effect that they had been punished—

All I know is that when I left, after begging and imploring him, and after General Myssura, his own Russian general, had begged him, to try those men, and after I had made every effort on earth to get him to try Bogomoletz and his officers, when he was in distress and his forces were being driven back I offered to give him a great armored train if he would try and execute those officers. General Janin, commanding the French Army, and myself had General Suzuki, commanding the Thirteenth Division of the Japanese Army, come to Verkhne Uinsk; and we told Suzuki the crimes that Semenov was committing, and we asked him for the sake of everybody to stop the killings along the railroad, so that the railroads would not be destroyed and so that the Czechoslovaks and Americans could evacuate the country.

Mr. CLARK. In connection with the raids of which you got reports, which were made in that valley, did you take that report up with the Japanese officers, too?

Colonel MORROW. I did.

Mr. CLARK. Did you get any reports as to what they did about it?

Colonel MORROW. I know what they did. They did nothing.

Mr. CLARK. When were the incidents with regard to these slaughter yards which you have related; in August, 1919, were they not?

Colonel MORROW. The slaughter yards operated at all times. Before I came into the country they were in operation. They continued those operations until after I had left the country. I got reports by the hundreds concerning the slaughter yards at Makaveyev and Borzya and

Diaria and Olivinnaya. I got reports from Russian railroad service men and from our own intelligence section.

Mr. CLARK. Did you have any knowledge as to the character of the people who were alleged to have been killed?

Colonel MORROW. The knowledge that I had of the men who were killed there was that they were generally old peasants or railroad employees in the country.

The CHAIRMAN. They were not belligerent forces which had been captured in battle?

Colonel MORROW. Understand the situation of the forces. When the Allies entered Siberia, between August, 1918, and up to November, 1919, the country was swept clear of all the armed Bolshevik forces. The Kolchak army was based on the Volga River in the European region. Kolchak himself had his army. There was a battle line along the Volga River.

Colonel Morrow makes it perfectly clear that there was really no fighting there in that portion of the country where this slaughter was taking place. The Bolshevik forces had been dispersed, if they had ever been there. There was no occasion for anything of this kind because of armed Bolsheviks being in the vicinity or undertaking to interfere either with American forces or with Semenov.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask leave to read a paragraph or two from an article by Charles H. Smith in the May number of the magazine Asia. Charles H. Smith was the American representative on the Interallied Railway Commission in Siberia, and to that commission was assigned the coordination of all communications in Siberia. On the board with Smith were Russian, British, American, French, Japanese, Chinese, Italian, and Czech representatives. Among those who sat on the committee at different periods were: For Great Britain, Sir Charles Elliot, now ambassador to Japan, W. E. O'Reilly, now minister of Bolivia, and W. G. Hodgson, now trade commissioner to Soviet Russia; for France, M. Bourgois, of the embassy at Tokyo, and M. André, consul at Vladivostok; for Japan, Mr. Matsudaira, secretary general of the Japanese delegation to the recent Washington conference.

In this article Mr. Smith says:

Siberia itself is not Bolshevik nor communist, and it never has been and never will be, unless alien invasion gives the Siberian peasantry no choice except between alien conquerors and their own rulers, even though the latter are Bolsheviks.

On page 374 he said:

We Americans, like the other allies, went there with those objects.

That is, to protect the railroad, and for perfectly legitimate purposes. He continued:

We stayed to fight imaginary Bolshevism. We gave our support to counterrevolutionaries like Kolchak instead of bolstering up Russian democracy with all the pillars we could construct out of our wealth and power. We provided the Japanese with their excuse for remaining.

Siberia is not Bolshevik, because it is populated by the descendants of political exiles, by the more adventurous and free-spirited Russians who came out as pioneers, and by the Cossacks, all of them more democratic than the Russians proper. Also the Siberians are not an urban people—there is not an industrial city in all Siberia—and even in European Russia it is only in the cities that there are Bolsheviks in any numbers. The Siberians had one ruling motive for their actions. That was to prevent the czarist régime from returning. For that reason they would have none of the numerous dictatorships, directorates, and other mushroom governments that sprang up in 1918 and 1919—Horvath in Harbin, Orloff in Pogranichnaya, Semenov at large, and, conspicuously, Kolchak in Omsk, all of whom were reactionaries under an anti-Bolshevik disguise to deceive the Allies. And when the Siberians did for a time support the Bolshevik forces in western Siberia, after the defeat of Kolchak, it was because they knew that they at least would not restore czarism.

Again and again I have heard this from Russian workmen as I have traveled back and forth across Siberia. The Siberians had confidence in the Czechs, who understood them and their democratic aspirations and therefore hated the Kolchak régime, and pathetic trust in the Americans.

At this period those two butchers, Ivanoff-Rinoff and Rozanoff, were in the full power of their activity, and on a larger scale Kalmykoff and Semenov. These men permitted their followers to torture their enemies, to brand them, gouge out their eyes, and whip them to death. Conscription of peasants was declared, but the peasants took to the hills, for they hated the Kolchak régime violently for its outrages. For revenge those who did not escape and the relatives of those who did were taken, tortured, and murdered. I have pictures and records of the bodies of victims, many pictures of corpses lying near to the charred ruins of their homes.

The Czechs were the first to show disaffection. They knew the Russian people and their dream of peaceful and democratic rule after their long agony. They knew the bitterness this cruel betrayal would work in them. The Czechs made formal protest, but although it was they who had done the fighting that kept the Bolshevik troops from swarming into Siberia, they were unheard. Some of the allied representatives joined in the protest. The railway committee, seeing the frustration of all its aims, sent telegrams to Kolchak and cablegrams to the home governments. Both were of no avail.

I ask permission to print this entire statement at the close of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BORAH. I now read from the hearings before the committee:

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you were there on the ground all the time and in charge of that territory?

Colonel MORROW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Commanding the American troops. You knew what was going on. You received your reports and talked with your own people, your own officers and men, and others. Who, in your opinion, as you were informed at the time, was responsible for these murders that were being committed in that territory?

Colonel MORROW. General Semenov.

The CHAIRMAN. Had you any doubt about it at that time?

Colonel MORROW. No; nor had anyone else in all Siberia. It was the common report and the common knowledge of everybody. It was the commonest subject of conversation in that country, and all over it.

I have received some affidavits since the hearings closed from soldiers who were on that expedition, and I read from the sworn statement of John C. Steinel, of Battle Creek, Mich., who said:

Armored trains frequently stopped at our station, but as the Cossacks were supposed to be allies, and other detachments of Americans were on both sides of us, we never considered there was much danger, although we usually took a few precautions against a surprise attack. Midnight, January 9, 1921, the armored train *Destroyer*, commanded by General Bogomilich, arrived from the east at Posolskaya, and Lieutenant Kendall and myself were immediately notified by Sergeant Robbins, who was sergeant of the guard. Orders were issued to awaken the men and hold them in the cars in readiness, and I went over to the station to see if there was anything unusual, because the station agent had informed us early in the evening that there would be no trains coming in that night. Everything appeared to be normal and the train proceeded to take on wood and water.

The station agent was noticed on the train, but, considering the fact that they were supposed to be our allies, we told the men to go back to sleep but be prepared for an emergency. We increased the guard around the cars and at the bridge about a half mile from our box cars, but instructed the men they could go to sleep, as there appeared to be no immediate danger.

At 1 o'clock Sergeant Robbins reported that things looked suspicious, and he was ordered to get the men up immediately and personally to put the engine out of commission if anything started. Lieutenant Kendall and myself immediately prepared to go out, and just as we came out of our car we were met with a burst of machine-gun fire from the Cossacks' armored car, 40 feet away, directly opposite. Our men came out as quickly as possible, most of them having been asleep, and crawled under our cars and proceeded to return the fire, which was directed against the passenger coaches, where lights were seen, and against the engine, as it seemed hopeless to fire at the armored cars, which had 6-inch concrete walls, loopholes, and turret for their firing.

Sergeant Robbins was killed instantly when he attempted to board the engine, and Corporal Tommie had his heel blown off by a grenade at the same time. They continued firing at us for several minutes from that position, and then moved a few hundred yards east, opening with their 1-pounder and 3-inch fieldpieces in addition to the machine guns. Our men, deployed under Lieutenant Kendall on the south side of the track, advanced toward the armored train, while I took an automatic-rifle squad of four men on the north side of the track, and for 45 minutes kept up a continual fire. It was 25 below zero, a bright moonlight night, with the snow about knee deep.

In addition to Sergeant Robbins, who was killed instantly, Private Montgomery died in a few hours from a machine-gun wound in the body and Corporal Tommie was wounded by a grenade.

They claimed that it was all a mistake; that they were changing guards and did not know the machine guns were loaded; but all indications pointed to the fact that they were prepared and they had expected to wipe us out and then burn the village, because of some trouble with the station agent. We later found that the station agent had sent a telegram to Chita requesting that an armored train be sent to this station because of some trouble.

The attack was unexpected and unwarranted, as they were supposed to be our allies, and I believe that General Bogomilich, who was on this train and who was in charge of all of Semenov's armored trains, made a deliberate attempt to wipe out the American detachment, and was acting under orders from his chief, Ataman Semenov. We were the only American detachment close to the tracks, where the Cossacks could attack with armored train, as others were in barracks away from railroad.

I have also the affidavit of Capt. William F. Gent, which I will ask to have inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Supreme Court, New York County.

John N. Boyle, trustee in bankruptcy of Yourveta Home & Foreign Trade Co. (Inc.), plaintiff, against Gregory Semenov, defendant.

STATE OF NEW YORK, County of New York, ss:

William F. Gent, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

"I am a captain in the United States Army; from August, 1919, until March, 1920, I was in Siberia on duty with the American Expeditionary Forces, and beginning September 22, 1919, until March, 1920, I was intelligence officer in the Twenty-seventh Infantry on duty in the Trans-Baikal region.

"I have read a copy of the affidavit of Gen. William S. Graves, verified the 4th day of April, 1922, and I am familiar with the episode referred to therein, concerning the killing of certain American soldiers. This action occurred on or about the 10th day of January, 1920, at 1 o'clock in the morning, at Posolskaya, which was in the said Trans-Baikal region. On January 14, 1920, Semenov's men, who had shot upon the American troops, were brought to the regimental headquarters of the Twenty-seventh Infantry at Berezovka; there were 4 officers and 48 men. All of them were interviewed in my office in reference to their acts. They admitted that they were under Semenov and gave various statements in regard to their activities, which are referred to in the affidavit of Charles H. Smith, concerning the extract from the article by Junius B. Wood. The statements contained therein are true to the best of my knowledge and belief. I have in my possession a personal diary, which I made at the time, and under date of January 14, 1920, I find the following entry:

"Started examining prisoners to-day; some of the testimony given is horrible—murders, rapes, robberies, and everything imaginable. Most of the men are drafted men and don't like the work, but are forced to do it. They are afraid to run away."

"Among other things these men told of the following incident: In the month of December, 1919, they captured civilians—consisting of

14 men and 1 woman. They stated that the woman had been outraged by the officers and the men, and thereafter the woman and the 14 men were taken to the river, which was frozen, and were forced to chop a hole in the ice and were then lined up and shot. The bodies were then crammed through the hole in the ice, whether there was life in them or not. The men who told me the foregoing actually took part in the shooting and rape. They stated that the incident occurred at Olovyanaya. Thereafter, I went to said place to verify their statements and saw the hole in the ice which they had described.

"These men also verified reports that we had received concerning the disposition of two trainloads of prisoners which Semenov's men had captured. The reports were that these were civil prisoners, captured by Semenov's men. Both of these trains had been moved back and forth along the Siberian railroad sealed. One of the trains contained in the neighborhood of 1,230 persons and the other in the neighborhood of 800 persons. The prisoners were sick with cholera and typhus, and many had died. The train containing about 1,230 was brought to Makaryevaya. There it was unloaded and all the prisoners were lined up and shot down by machine guns. The other train, containing about 800 prisoners, was brought to Adrianovka and the prisoners were there unloaded and also shot down by machine guns. The soldiers who described this had either taken part in the same or had first-hand information. The former place became generally known as 'The Barrel of Blood' and the latter became generally known as 'The Bucket of Blood.' After receiving this report, I personally went to Adrianovka and verified the statements made to me by the soldiers. I there saw a long trench which was covered with railroad ties. I pulled aside several of these and there saw the bones and clothes of numerous human bodies.

"The foregoing are mere isolated instances which were brought to my attention of the atrocities committed by Semenov's men—supposedly acting under his orders. He was generally regarded as a mere freelance bandit, and was thoroughly hated and despised by all the American troops and most of the Russian population because of his abuse of the civilians. By his general attitude he was considered as very antagonistic to Americans and their operations, and did everything possible to obstruct American movements in Siberia."

"WM. F. GENT,
"Captain, Twenty-second Infantry, U. S. A."

Sworn to before me this 5th day of April, 1922.

PAULA GROSS,
Notary Public, New York Co., No. 377, N. Y. Reg. No. 3183.
Commission expires March 30, 1923.

Mr. BORAH. This is a very brief statement with reference to what the record discloses. It would seem that General Semenov was in complete control of this territory; that he was the supreme authority, so far as the Russian forces were concerned, for that territory at times, although at times he seemed, in a way, to recognize the authority of Kolchak.

During the time that he was in control of this territory a reign of massacre continued such as I know nothing of in all the history of the world. As the hearings disclose, they took one day 53 carloads of prisoners, from 30 to 35 people in a car—people whom they had taken from the different localities and communities not as the result of a fight or a contest or battle but people they had picked up from their homes out of the suburbs or the villages—drove them out to the slaughter pens, as they called them, two different trains running out for that purpose, marched them off the trains, turned the machine guns on them, slaughtered them, and pushed them over into the holes which had been dug, as if they were animals. These facts are narrated by officers and soldiers of the American Army. They are corroborated by the American representative of the Siberian interallied railway commission. They are all but indescribable and unbelievable. But the facts narrated compel us to believe.

There can be very little doubt in the mind of anyone from this record that it was Semenov's desire to drive the American forces out of that territory. The officers in charge of the American forces entertained little doubt in regard to it. It was, I presume, because the American forces were there really seeking to protect the railroad and were not interested in the kind of a campaign in which Semenov was interested. They were, in other words, a hindrance to the full execution of his purpose and his murderous schemes, and this attack upon the 10th of January was, from the evidence as it appears to us, a deliberate attack upon what were supposed to be the friendly forces there representing our interests. We had two soldiers killed, others wounded—they were in every sense murdered. Only the vigilance and the courage of our men prevented the entire number at that point from being assassinated. The man who is responsible for it is now our guest in this country.

Mr. President, when Semenov came to this country among the first gentlemen whom he visited was Boris Bakhmeteff. A subpoena was issued for Bakhmeteff and he refused to respond. The subpoena was answered through the Secretary of State stating that Bakhmeteff was the recognized ambassador of the Russian Government, and that he was therefore protected by virtue of the statute with which we are all familiar and the principle of which no one desires to question.

Early in the spring of 1917 the Imperial Government of Russia fell. It was succeeded by the "new provisional government of Russia," as it was called, which was recognized by our Government April 12, 1917. George Bakhmeteff, the resident imperial ambassador, immediately presented his resigna-

tion to the Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing, and left the embassy. On the 26th of April the minister of foreign affairs of the provisional government, Paul Milukoff, at Petrograd, sent Boris Bakhmeteff as special commissioner to the United States. Boris Bakhmeteff, as such special commissioner designated, with his assistants, arrived in Tokyo about May 20. In the meantime the provisional government had fallen and Kerensky was in control.

On May 15, 1917, the Kerensky government had revoked the orders of Milukoff and authorized Bakhmeteff "to proceed to Washington and await further instructions there." Bakhmeteff at this time was not accredited to this Government as ambassador and had no other instructions from the then existing Russian Government than to proceed to Washington and await instructions. I desire to say here that I have not been able to consult original sources, but I feel sure the facts as I state them are substantially correct.

On June 19, 1917, Bakhmeteff arrived in the city of Washington and at once took possession of the Russian Embassy. July 5 he was formally recognized as ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary from Russia to the United States of America.

It is said, Mr. President, upon what seems to be good authority, that Kerensky made no secret of his dislike as to the selection of Bakhmeteff, and was at first disposed to direct his return to Russia, but changed the order and directed him to proceed to Washington to await instructions, and it was in that manner that he arrived. Boris Bakhmeteff, as I understand, had visited America prior to this and was supposed to have been interested in placing some investments here for the Czar. He was, in other words, thought to be too closely associated with the Czarist party to be satisfactory to Kerensky. But he is supposed to have directed him to proceed to Washington for further instructions.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator, for information, when Bakhmeteff was recognized by our Government as ambassador, did he present credentials? He must have done so, I presume.

Mr. BORAH. I do not speak with absolute accuracy, but I am informed that he never did present any credentials until about the 25th of August, when a question arose in the mind of Mr. McAdoo whether he had not been paying out about enough money until he saw some credentials. Then some correspondence took place between the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury, and there may be credentials in the office of the Secretary of State dating from about that time. I do not think there were before. I doubt very much if there is now—that is, credentials in the usual form accrediting him as ambassador. There is much doubt upon that question.

Mr. LODGE. I only wanted to ascertain if there had been any credentials presented. I thought there must have been credentials presented at some time.

Mr. BORAH. My opinion is that there are not to-day in the State Department any credentials in proper form accrediting Bakhmeteff to this country. I should be very glad to see them if they are there. All the evidence points to the fact that they finally continued to do business with him upon a cablegram from the Kerensky government that Kerensky recognized him, but no formal accrediting and proper credentials, so far as I have been able to ascertain, and we can only deal with this from the outside, have ever been presented. Of course, not having access to the files, I may be mistaken.

Bakhmeteff was recognized July 5, 1917. On July 6, 1917, he went to the Secretary of the Treasury and got a loan of \$35,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator give those dates again?

Mr. BORAH. On July 5, 1917, Bakhmeteff was recognized as ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary from Russia. On July 6, 1917, according to the record as I have seen it—

Mr. LODGE. The very next day?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; the next day he went to the Treasury and secured a loan of \$35,000,000. On July 13, 1917, Boris Bakhmeteff again drew upon the Secretary of the Treasury for \$10,000,000. On August 25, 1917, the press carried this statement:

Word from Ambassador Francis has encouraged the State Department in the success of the provisional government and a further loan of \$100,000,000 has been made to the new ambassador, Boris Bakhmeteff.

On November 17, nine days after the Kerensky government had fallen, as a matter of fact, Bakhmeteff had secured from this Government loans to the amount of \$187,729,750. This all took place between July 6, 1917, and November 17, 1917.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the figures the Senator is giving. I hope I shall not disturb him by asking a question?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly not.

Mr. LODGE. About that time—I can not give the exact date—there was some bond bill before the Committee on Finance and the then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, came before the committee. In the course of the discussion on that bill inquiries were made as to this matter of credits and, as I recall it, when he was asked about the Russian credit he said that at that time—and I have not the exact date—he had given a credit of \$90,000,000, but that \$45,000,000 was retained in order to pay for locomotives contracted for by the Russian Government; and that the other \$45,000,000 was in the hands of Bakhmeteff. I know that statement was made in substantially the form in which I have given it, but it now appears that Bakhmeteff had a great deal more than the sum Mr. McAdoo named.

Mr. BORAH. I will say to the Senator that I obtained these facts from an examination of the hearings. There have been two or three hearings in which the facts have been discussed. For instance, in the hearing with reference to the deportation of Martens they were pretty fully gone into. There was a hearing before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in which the matter was discussed. I may not be absolutely accurate as to all these dates, but I am sufficiently accurate to make substantially true the statement which I am presenting. A date would not be material if there is a discrepancy of a day or two.

In the meantime the Kerensky government had fallen on November 8, 1917. On November 15 Francis, our ambassador, notified the Secretary of State that the Kerensky government had fallen. Kerensky went into exile. His entire structure disappeared. It has never assumed to perform any of the functions of government since. The government which Bakhmeteff assumed to represent ceased to exist completely and absolutely.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to make some observations with reference to the present status of Bakhmeteff, and I do so with entire respect for the Secretary of State, entertaining simply a difference of opinion with reference to the application of the statute.

I can not conceive of a man being an ambassador without a government. Since the 8th day of November, 1917, there has been in existence no government which Mr. Bakhmeteff has assumed to represent. Since that time there has been reared a different government, a structure which calls itself the soviet government, and that government, whatever it may be, is nevertheless the only government which exists in Russia, superseding, as it did, the Kerensky government. It has raised armies and maintained armies and has fought battles. It has been recognized by other governments, has made trade contracts with a number of other governments, and is to-day recognized throughout the world as the government in Russia. I do not mean to say by that that all governments have recognized it in the sense that they have been willing to accept an ambassador, and so forth, but our own officers and our own Government have proceeded upon the theory that the Kerensky government is gone and that the soviet government is there doing business. The soviet government, which succeeded the Kerensky government, is now represented at Genoa in one of the most important international conferences in the history of nations. It is the government of Russia.

How could there be such a thing as an ambassador enjoying the immunities and privileges of an ambassador after his government has disappeared? The privilege of an ambassador, the immunity of an ambassador, belongs and attaches to the office and not the individual. It is the government, not the individual, whose privilege and immunity is covered by the statute.

I could cite for an hour the incidents in which we have recognized the existence of the soviet government. For instance, Mr. Colby, in his letter of August 10, 1920, in one paragraph, said.

It is not possible for the Government of the United States to recognize the present rulers of Russia as a government with which the relations common to friendly governments can be maintained.

And again:

In the view of this Government there can not be any common ground upon which it can stand with a power whose conceptions of international relations are so entirely alien to its own, so utterly repugnant to its moral sense. There can be no mutual confidence or trust, no respect even, if pledges are to be given and agreements made with a cynical repudiation of their obligations already in the mind of one of the parties. We can not recognize, hold official relations with, or give friendly receptions to the agents of a government which is determined and bound to conspire against our institutions; whose diplomats will be the agitators of dangerous revolts; whose spokesmen say that they sign agreements with no intention of keeping them.

We recognize the fact that there is a government there so inimical to our conception of what government should be that we have refused to recognize it—nevertheless a government. There it is. We do not like it, but we admit and proceed upon

the theory that the soviet government exists and that the government of Kerensky does not exist. We recognized the former; it is gone. We refuse to recognize the latter, but there it is. To illustrate: Would anyone claim that Kerensky is president or chief ruler of any government anywhere? Yet we have on our hands here an ambassador of that government of which Kerensky was chief head.

Upon page 5 the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wilson, in a letter to Charles Recht, Esq., counselor at law, 114 West Fortieth Street, New York, recognizes the same state of affairs as is outlined in the Colby letter.

On page 13 the President of the United States, in his address to Congress at the beginning of his administration, said:

We do not recognize the government of Russia nor tolerate the propaganda which emanates therefrom, but we do not forget the traditions of Russian friendship.

There are any number of instances in which we have proceeded upon the theory that the government which Bakhmeteff was supposed to represent, of which he is the ambassador, if he is an ambassador, has disappeared, and no government which accepts him has taken its place. That condition of affairs has existed for nearly five years. Now, is it possible, Mr. President, that a man may be an ambassador, enjoying the privileges and the immunities of an ambassador, unless he has a government back of him? The rights, the privileges, and the immunities attach to the office and not to the individual. When the government disappears the office disappears. His government has been abolished, as it were, just as if we were to abolish a judgeship, the judge would disappear; he would not be permitted to draw his salary or to perform his functions. Bakhmeteff's government exists no more, and has not existed for five years. Under those circumstances it seems to me that we ought to be entitled to ask Mr. Bakhmeteff to come before the committee.

I am perfectly aware that we are advised through the public prints and through what seem to be inspired articles that we can get Mr. Bakhmeteff's statement through the Secretary of State. In the first place, Mr. President, so far as I am individually concerned, I do not propose to recognize the perfectly fraudulent claim that he is an ambassador. In the second place, that kind of an examination, under the peculiar circumstances which exist in this matter, would be utterly worthless. There are some precedents along this line which I find in Mr. Moore's Digest of International Law. In 1856, as an illustration, a case of homicide occurred in Washington in the presence of the Dutch minister, whose testimony was deemed altogether material for the trial. Inasmuch as he was exempt from the ordinary processes to compel the attendance of witnesses, an application was made by the District attorney, through the Secretary of State, to M. Dubois to appear and testify. The minister having refused, by the unanimous advice of his colleagues, in a note of 11th of May, 1856, to appear as a witness, Mr. Marcy on May 15, 1856, instructed Mr. Belmont, minister of the United States at The Hague, to bring the matter to the attention of the Netherlands Government.

Now, Mr. President, suppose that the situation here was sufficiently serious to impress the mind of the Secretary of State that Mr. Bakhmeteff ought to appear, and that Mr. Bakhmeteff should, upon the advice of his colleagues of the diplomatic corps, refuse to appear, and the Secretary of State desired to do the only thing that he could do, to take the matter up with his government, with what government would he take it up? To what government is Bakhmeteff responsible, and how could he be compelled to comply either with our request or the request of his government? He enjoys the immunities, he enjoys the privileges of an ambassador, and yet he has no government and no one to whom we could make him responsible, even if we desired.

In his note Mr. Marcy said:

It is not doubted that both by the usage of nations and the laws of the United States, M. Dubois has the legal right to decline to give his testimony; but he is at perfect liberty to exercise his privilege to the extent requested, and by doing so he does not subject himself to the jurisdiction of the country. The circumstances of this case are such as to appeal strongly to the universal sense of justice. In the event of M. Van Hall's suggestion that M. Dubois might give his deposition out of court in the case, you will not omit to state that by our Constitution, in all criminal prosecutions, the accused has the right to be confronted with the witnesses against him, and hence, in order that the testimony should be legal, it must be given before the court.

I have not been able to find out from Mr. Moore's work just what became of this case, but I find in Halleck's International Law this statement:

In 1856 the United States of America requested the recall of the minister of the Netherlands for having refused to appear before the court in the city of Washington to give his testimony in a criminal cause which was then pending, and in which this minister was a most important witness.

It would seem, therefore, from the facts as given to us in Moore's Digest of International Law and from the quotation

from Mr. Halleck's International Law that Mr. Marcy finally requested the recall of the Dutch minister because he refused to testify.

I submit that in the present instance there is no one with whom we may lodge any such request; there is no one with whom we may correspond, to whom we may make a suggestion with reference to the proper conduct of the alleged ambassador of the Russian government here.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Idaho a question at that point for information?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. I presume that in the investigation of this matter he may have some information of which I have no knowledge whatever. The question I wish to ask is, Has any government or any body that has assumed to act as a government of the Russian people notified our Government that Bakhmeteff no longer represents the government of Russia?

Mr. BORAH. I do not know definitely. I am of the opinion that fact was brought to the attention of our Government.

Mr. McCUMBER. The facts which the Senator gives and which are within our own knowledge would upon their face indicate, of course, that there is a different government in Russia from that which Bakhmeteff at one time represented. But has that government in any way represented to our Government a statement that Bakhmeteff no longer represents Russia?

Mr. BORAH. Well, Martens came to this country for the purpose of doing something of that kind, but they put him under investigation and deported him. He did make a demand upon Bakhmeteff for the possession of the Russian embassy and for its property; and I will not be positive about it, but he made known the fact to Bakhmeteff and also to the Government here that he assumed to represent the soviet government and desired to be recognized as such representative. Whether he formally presented any credentials I do not know.

Mr. President, it is not an immaterial matter with me that Mr. Bakhmeteff should refuse to appear at this hearing. One of the first men that Semenov called upon was Bakhmeteff. There have been different reports made as to what occurred, but as those reports are not verified in the sense that I could state them as being absolutely reliable, perhaps it would be better that I should not state them in detail; but sufficient reports have been made to make it exceedingly important for the committee to be informed concerning the facts charged with reference to Bakhmeteff's reception of Semenov, why he wanted to see him, and what Semenov's business in this country was. Under the circumstances those questions are of sufficient importance to make it exceedingly interesting for the committee to know about them.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, does the Senator know where Bakhmeteff saw Semenov? Was it here in Washington?

Mr. BORAH. I understand so; but it may have been in New York.

Mr. STERLING. When was it?

Mr. BORAH. It was some time shortly after Semenov arrived in the country, but the date I can not give. It was, however, before the investigation conducted by the committee took place.

Mr. STERLING. There was no testimony in regard to it in the hearings, was there?

Mr. BORAH. No; there was no testimony with regard to it, but there is no doubt that he saw Bakhmeteff. The only doubt is in regard as to what took place after he saw him, as to what part Bakhmeteff took in this entire affair. For instance, there was published an interview given out by Bakhmeteff to the press. I read afterwards that it was contradicted, but I do not know whether that is true or not. There is no doubt, however, that Semenov saw Bakhmeteff, consulted with him, counseled with him. As to why he wanted to see him and what he did after he arrived at the Russian Embassy and what comfort he got out of the situation, I do not know. There are only two men who know that. One of them I am seeking to bring before the committee.

There is another phase of this matter, Mr. President, in which I am interested. Mr. Bakhmeteff has received from this Government a loan of \$187,000,000. My investigation leads me to the conclusion that no part of that money ever served the Russian people or any Government of the Russian people. I do not believe that any Russian Government or the Russian people ever received the slightest advantage or benefit from that \$187,000,000, or any part of it. I am perfectly aware that it is said there was an effort to make purchases and to provide materials which would be utilized for the benefit of the Russian people.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit another question?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. Does the Senator recall the time when Semenoff was in Washington or was reported to be in Washington?

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not.

Mr. STERLING. I will say to the Senator I do not remember to have heard that he was ever in Washington, and in consultation with Senators in their seats they do not recall that he was ever in Washington.

Mr. BORAH. I can not state what the fact may be as to that, but so far as my view of it is concerned, it is wholly immaterial where Semenoff saw Bakhmeteff; whether Bakhmeteff went to New York or went to San Francisco to meet him.

Mr. STERLING. I understood the Senator to say a while ago in answer to my question that he had seen him in Washington.

Mr. BORAH. I so understand, and I have letters in my possession which state that fact, but I can not assure the Senator that the statement is correct. I undertake to say, however, that there is not a particle of doubt that Semenoff saw Bakhmeteff and talked with him.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask what Semenoff is doing in this country?

Mr. BORAH. The statement was made that Semenoff was on his way to France; that he was simply passing through this country. I do not believe that to be true. I think he was here for the purpose of raising money to start another movement in Siberia. There was an interview given out at Tokyo that that was his purpose in coming here, and there are a great many things to indicate that that is what he had in mind, until a disturbance was made with reference to his coming. Since that time he has not, of course, pursued his purposes, even if he entertained them in the first instance.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, may I be allowed a word there?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. As I recall the testimony in the case, it showed that he merely made an application for transit through the country, in the first place, and his original application was turned down; permission was refused him; but afterwards the special board of inquiry changed their decision and admitted him for transit across the country, if I remember correctly.

Mr. BORAH. The statement that he was admitted simply for transit is correct, but it amounts to nothing, for the reason that he could stay just as long as he wanted to stay by forfeiting the deposit. It will be recalled that the Commissioner General of Immigration, before the committee, said that a transit permit really amounted to nothing; that the person who was given such permission could remain here indefinitely if he desired to, but that if he remained in the country he would not have returned to him the \$8 which, it seems, it is necessary to deposit to secure such a permit.

Mr. OVERMAN. Has Semenoff been ordered deported?

Mr. BORAH. No.

Mr. OVERMAN. He has been arrested, has he not?

Mr. BORAH. He was arrested in a civil case, under a civil judgment for confiscations which he made of some property in Siberia, and the court at Harbin rendered judgment against him. It was under that judgment that he was arrested.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator please, is he in this country now?

Mr. BORAH. He is somewhere about New York.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not know what the rulings of the Department of Labor should be in the matter, but I assume that the right of transit does not give the right to remain indefinitely in the country.

Mr. BORAH. I am of the opinion, from a letter which I have from the Secretary of Labor, that he is getting a little impatient about Semenoff's long stay, and my opinion is that the Secretary of Labor will take due action in regard to him. That would be my judgment. The testimony is now in the hands of the Secretary of Labor, and I think the record discloses that the Labor Department did not desire Semenoff's coming into this country at all in the first instance. All the facts which I have read here have been on file with the departments from the beginning—General Grave's report, including Colonel Morrow's report, and Smith's report—and these matters were brought to the attention in brief of the immigration officers at the port where Semenoff was admitted; but, for some reason or other, they saw fit to admit him, possibly upon the theory that they believed that he was just passing across the country.

I was going to say, Mr. President, that Mr. Bakhmeteff has secured from this Government in excess of \$187,000,000. From the most diligent inquiry I have been able to pursue, I can not find that the Russian people ever received any benefit from that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator restate the dates within which that amount of money was received by him from this Government?

Mr. BORAH. From the 6th day of July, 1917, to the 17th day of November, 1917.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question in that connection? It has been stated that with this money that was turned over to Russia certain military supplies were purchased, and that after the downfall of the Kerensky government these military supplies were sold and purchased by our Government.

Mr. BORAH. Part of them were, I think, perhaps all of them; I do not know; but part of them were.

Mr. POMERENE. And that the money for those purchases was paid over to representatives of the Russian Government, when it is stated that the amount of those supplies thus purchased by this Government should have been credited on the debt of Russia to this Government. Has the Senator any information on that subject?

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator has stated it correctly. I have been unable to understand why, for instance, our Government purchased back these supplies; but we paid the money over to Boris Bakhmeteff.

Mr. POMERENE. I can understand why we might have purchased back those supplies, and done it in a proper way; but I do not understand why we did not get credit for the amount on the money which was due this Government from the Russian Government.

Mr. BORAH. I was going to say that that is the precise proposition about which I should like to have an opportunity of questioning the ex-ambassador. The transaction may be all right. On the face of it, it looks very bad. If it is all right, there is not any reason in the world why he should not come before a committee and state the facts. He is relying upon his immunity and his privilege as an ambassador from a government which he knows does not exist, which of itself, in my mind, brands the entire transaction with a wrongful purpose.

Mr. POMERENE. It seems to me there is another way of getting at that fact, if the Senator desires it. Certainly there must be some one in authority here in this Government who knows whether or not these purchases were made by our Government from the representatives of the Russian Government.

Mr. BORAH. I think there is no doubt about that. That has been shown.

Mr. POMERENE. And it can then be further ascertained whether or not the amount of those purchases was credited on the debt which Russia owed to us.

Mr. BORAH. Those facts could be gathered. I think it will be found that those facts are already gathered; but I want to know what has become of the money which has been in Bakhmeteff's hands since the time we paid it back to him for the purchase of these things.

Mr. President, the statement which I am about to make I wish to make with due consideration.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Do I understand from the Senator that there has been paid to somebody more than \$187,000,000, or whatever it is?

Mr. BORAH. No.

Mr. LENROOT. I understood from the question of the Senator from Ohio that he understood that that sum was paid, and then an additional sum for the repurchase of goods by this Government.

Mr. POMERENE. I was a little preoccupied at the moment and I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. LENROOT. I asked the Senator whether he understood that more money was paid to somebody on the Russian loan than the original amount of the loan.

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, no.

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not understand that.

Mr. LENROOT. I understood the Senator to inquire why this money was not credited. He understands that when this Government purchased goods it paid additional cash for them.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from Idaho made the statement that loans were made approximating \$187,000,000. With that money, as I understood, Russian representatives bought military supplies. Later the Kerensky government fell. They had no need for these supplies in this country, and they could not be transported to Russia under that peculiar situation. It was at that juncture that it is said that the United States Government repurchased from these Russian agents or representatives these military supplies. At that time the Russian Government owed us \$187,000,000; and my query is, Why was not the amount of those purchases credited on that loan of \$187,000,000?

Mr. LENROOT. That was my question to the Senator from Idaho, and the Senator from Idaho states that he does not think more than an aggregate of about \$187,000,000 was paid out. The Senator's question involves \$187,000,000 plus whatever sum was paid for the repurchase of the supplies.

Mr. POMERENE. No, no.

Mr. LENROOT. I can not understand it in any other way.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, were not a great many railroad engines bought for the Russians in this country which, through the Railroad Administration here, were transferred somehow, by purchase or otherwise? I think during the war they bought a number of engines from the Baldwin Co., and they were transferred and were sold here, probably to the railroad director, by the Russian Government. What became of the money I do not know.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have not looked it up of late, but this is as I understand the transaction:

In the year 1917 the Government of the United States advanced to the Russian Government \$187,000,000 at different periods within six months' time. Those advances were made for the purpose of purchasing goods in the United States, just as the Senator from Ohio says. The purchases were made and the payments for those goods were made to a certain extent out of the \$187,000,000 advanced by this Government.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. How much?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not remember exactly how much the goods that this Government bought back from the Russian Government were; but I think the position that was taken was that after the Government of the United States had loaned this money to the Russian Government whatever goods were purchased with that money belonged to the Russian Government, and in case they sold the goods, if they sold them to the Government of the United States, the Government of the United States had to pay for them. If Russia had sold them to the Baldwin Locomotive Co., the Baldwin Locomotive Co. would have to pay for them; and I understand, Mr. President, that Russia was paid the money, and that was not a part of the \$187,000,000 that was loaned. That money went for the purchase of the goods sold by Russia. The goods belonged to Russia, and the money received for those goods was in addition to the \$187,000,000 loaned to the Russian Government.

Mr. BORAH. In addition to that, Mr. President, from time to time small sums, I do not know to what extent, have been paid to Bakhmeteff for the purpose of maintaining the embassy here.

Mr. SMOOT. I think I have that amount here.

Mr. BORAH. I was about to say, Mr. President, that since this hearing was begun a number of statements have been made to me as to how this money has been used. A priest of the Greek Church has appeared in my office twice and has made statements in some detail as to certain investments which have been made. He has given the details; he has given the property; he has told where it is, and says that he is perfectly familiar with the facts and is willing to testify in regard to the matter. Other statements have been made along the same line, but not so much in detail.

This is the question which I submit: Is it to the interest of this Government to give Mr. Bakhmeteff his immunity as an ambassador—ambassador of a government which disappeared five years ago—when the question of his relationship in this country to Semenoff, the man who assassinated American soldiers and who murdered right and left, is under investigation? Upon what possible theory shall we throw about him a shelter designed to protect men who in fact represent governments, ambassadors in good faith, maintaining the dignity and the honor of their governments? Under what theory shall we throw that protection about him, when we know that his government no longer exists?

Secondly, I think it is due to those who have to pay the amounts which are loaned to these governments that the real facts concerning the use of this money be known. If this money has been invested in private property in the cities of New York and Chicago, it must be manifest that it is not being utilized in the manner in which this Government designed that it should be at the time it was loaned. It must be manifest that some one has broken faith. It must be perfectly manifest that he is no longer representing or pretending to represent a government as its ambassador, but that he is representing himself and making his investments.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. No other interpretation can be placed upon the language cautiously and carefully used by the

Senator from Idaho than that this pseudo ambassador has appropriated this money to his own use and invested it in property in New York and Chicago and taken the title in his own name.

Mr. BORAH. No; he has not taken it in his own name. He has taken it in the name of a corporation which was organized for the purpose of holding it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Who were the incorporators?

Mr. BORAH. The names of the incorporators I have not on my desk, but I have them in my office, and the name of the company, and the description of the property, and the street where it is located.

Mr. President, I say again that these facts are put out by men who are perfectly responsible. There is just one man who can put the matter in such condition or give such explanation that there can be no longer any question about it. If he is acting in good faith, he will no longer for a moment claim the privilege of this statute. He will not shelter himself behind the privileges and immunities of a statute designed and intended to protect the rights of governments and not individuals.

He will come out from under cover, a false and fraudulent cover, and give the American people and his own people a statement of the true facts in regard to it, and he will explain why he received a man who is now regarded as the monster of the modern world.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho has just made the statement that a corporation was organized, and that this property was in the possession of that corporation, or in its name. Clearly, that corporation must have some books, there must be certain officials, and those officials could be called before the committee, it would seem to me.

Mr. BORAH. They can be; but, Mr. President, I am determined, so far as I am concerned, to go to the source of authority in this matter. There must be some reason for protecting this man with which the public is not yet familiar. The reason may be a perfectly legitimate one, and do credit to those who are relying upon it, but as the facts now appear, Mr. President, the result of protection is to shield one who has not dealt with this Government or with his own government according to the principles of honest dealing.

APPENDIX.

WHAT HAPPENED IN SIBERIA.

(By Charles H. Smith, McAlpin Hotel.)

It was St. Petersburg on that unforgettable Saturday in March, 1917. I was out in the Nevsky Prospekt to see how much excitement there was after the strike that had been called the night before. In the crowd I was brushed against one of my Russian friends of the upper classes and we stopped to chat. "The old régime will fall," he said, and then, pausing to enjoy the obvious effect of his words as registered on my face, "that will end it forever." I thought that he was mad; and so would have thought every other foreigner in Russia that day, and nearly every Russian.

The truth of his words I have seen vindicated by events every day from then until a few months ago, when I returned to America, and everywhere across the endless reaches of Russia from the Gallic quondam capital to its farthest outpost on the Pacific. Seven or eight times since then I have crossed Siberia, and it is with the Siberian reflection of the revolution that I have had most contact. By reason of my work my contact has been necessarily most intimate.

A railroad man by profession, I went to Russia in a private capacity in 1916. When America entered the war I was dissuaded from going to France by Mr. Francis, our ambassador, who told me there would be no lack of opportunity for service in Russia, which only one who knew Russia and its language could do. And a few months later I was appointed American aid to Mr. L. A. Oustrouloff, associate minister of communications, chosen by the Kerensky government as special commissar for the rehabilitation of the Trans-Siberian Railway. Less than a year later, when the allied expeditionary forces arrived in Siberia, I was appointed American representative on the interallied railway committee, to which was assigned the coordination of all communications in Siberia and the restoration of transportation. On the board were Russian, British, American, French, Japanese, Chinese, Italian, and Czech representatives. Among those who sat on the committee at different periods were: For Great Britain, Sir Charles Elliot, now ambassador to Japan; W. E. O'Reilly, now minister to Bolivia; and W. G. Hodgson, now trade commissioner to Soviet Russia; for France, M. Bourgeois, of the embassy at Tokyo, and M. André, consul at Vladivostok; for Japan, Mr. Matsuda, secretary general of the Japanese delegation to the recent Washington conference. I sat throughout as American representative.

The railway is the key to political and economic control of Siberia and also the most valuable developed asset, and therefore the biggest stake in the country. It and its branches are the only fast means of communication. The committee became therefore the clearing house of all military, diplomatic, and political activities of the intervention. Before troop movements could be made, or government supplies or even commercial shipments forwarded, the committee had to be consulted. It was therefore on the inside of the inside of Siberian affairs. Under the committee, it should also be explained, were two boards—the technical board, to supervise operations, and the military transportation board, to coordinate military traffic.

For three years I sat with the committee, reporting directly to the State Department and receiving instructions from the State Department. I went as a railway man and found myself soon with the duties of a diplomat. There I saw not only what my Russian friend had prophesied, but what no man could have prophesied: Siberia, for

decades the continent-wide dungeon of the freest spirits of Russia, became a new arena of international contention, one with the Balkans, the Near East, the African coast, and China, especially China. Both countries have become "problems" out of the same causes—the disturbing influences of a selfish alien interference. They afford a new piece of evidence for Shaw's dictum that history tells us that we never learn anything by what history tells us; while repenting by way of international conferences for the errors we made in China a hundred years ago, we repeat simultaneously the same errors in Siberia. And I am convinced in my own mind that we shall some day see in Siberia, too, as we are beginning dimly to see in China, that there can be no progress without threat to the peace of the world unless Siberia is free from foreign interference and unhampered in working out its problems.

Nor is the method of solving these problems inconsequential to the future of any country, no matter how distant. Siberia is now remote, sparsely populated, and of small immediate political importance. But it is a great storehouse of raw material, and the world is crying for fuel to feed the fires left dying by the war. Remember that before the war one-ninth of the world's gold production came from Siberia. In Siberia are the largest timber supplies in the world and the biggest fisheries. There are huge, undeveloped fields of coal and oil and minerals. Siberia may also become a world granary, as was European Russia. Monopolistic control of Siberia's resources may well produce another war.

As in Siberia, so in China, the concrete, pressing question is, What shall we do with Japan? In Siberia, also, Japan is the enfant terrible with giant ambitions. In its broadest outlines the present situation in Siberia can be briefly put. The wave of counter-revolution has passed. It will not recur, unless rolled up by the magnetic force of foreign gold, in this case Japanese gold, with French moral contributions. There is at Chita a struggling government, known as the Far Eastern Republic. Whatever may be true of the private economic beliefs of some of the men at the head of it, it is a democratic government. It is not Bolshevik nor communist, because Siberia itself is not Bolshevik nor communist, and it never has been and never will be, unless alien invasion gives the Siberian peasantry no choice except between alien conquerors and their own rulers, even though the latter are Bolshevik. And with respect to the competency of the government, I can testify that where its sway is unchallenged there is order. Disorder exists only where there are foreign troops and consequent foreign meddling. The irksomeness of alien regulations to civilian populations, the friction produced by the arrogance of conquering troops, the resultant defiance by the civilians inevitably produce a clash. Sometimes they are intended to have precisely that effect.

The chief obstacle to the consolidation of power by the Chita government and the extension of its sway over all Siberia is the presence of Japanese troops. The Japanese now have troops in and about Vladivostok, on the coast and on the Chinese Eastern Railway, between Manchuria and the Siberian border. Since Vladivostok is the only important port of entry, as well as the chief commercial distributing point and the railroad, its control by Japan may be likened to a clutch on a single artery somewhere in the human body that can choke off the circulation of blood over the whole body. You have only to consider what would be the results if an alien power held the New York terminus of the New York Central Railroad and the harbor. Also, Japanese control of Vladivostok can and does serve as a breeding place for counter-revolutions, local disturbances, and subtler forms of obstruction. First one Russian hireling, and then another, is bought by bribery, fitted out and sent off either as a frank bandit or as a more ambitious insurrecto by the Japanese. Thus the Japanese are able to announce to the world that disorder prevails in Siberia and they must remain to prevent chaos. In 1920, for instance, when the Japanese were forced to evacuate the city of Khabarovsk under allied pressure, they caused it to be noised about that it would be dangerous for residents to remain after they left and offered facilities to all who wished to depart under Japanese protection. Then it was learned by the Chinese merchants in the city and immediately telegraphed to the Chinese consul in Vladivostok that the Japanese had arranged with the leaders of a band of 2,000 Chinese brigands, supplied with Japanese arms, to pillage the city as soon as the Japanese left. This report was confirmed from Russian sources, and the Chita government, which was taking over control, rushed troops to the city and frustrated the plan. But such plans have not always been frustrated.

That affairs have come to this pass is merely the logical sequence of the inexcusable torturing of the original object of the allied intervention into something totally different. The Allies entered Siberia to keep military supplies accumulated in Vladivostok from falling into the hands of German and Austrian prisoners in Siberia and to evacuate the Czech troops who had started across Siberia from eastern Europe in order to get to the western front via the Pacific and America. We Americans, like the other allies, went there with those objects. We stayed to fight imaginary Bolshevism. We gave our support to counter-revolutionaries like Kolchak, instead of bolstering up Russian democracy with all the pillars we could construct out of our wealth and power. We provided the Japanese with their excuse for remaining.

Siberia is not Bolshevik, because it is populated by the descendants of political exiles, by the more adventurous and free-spirited Russians who came out as pioneers, and by the Cossacks, all of them more democratic than the Russians proper. Also, the Siberians are not an urban people—there is not an industrial city in all Siberia—and even in European Russia it is only in the cities that there are Bolsheviks in any numbers. The Siberians had one ruling motive for their actions. That was to prevent the czarist régime from returning. For that reason they would have none of the numerous dictatorships, directorates, and other mushroom governments that sprang up in 1918 and 1919—Horvath in Harbin, Orloff in Pogranichnaya, Semenov at large, and conspicuously, Kolchak in Omsk, all of whom were reactionaries under an anti-Bolshevik disguise to deceive the Allies. And when the Siberians did for a time support the Bolshevik forces in western Siberia, after the defeat of Kolchak, it was because they knew that they at least would not restore czarism.

Again and again I have heard this from Russian workmen as I have traveled back and forth across Siberia. The Siberians had confidence in the Czechs—who understood them and their democratic aspirations, and therefore hated the Kolchak régime—and pathetic trust in the Americans. I have had conferences in railway centers with workmen's committees, composed of hostile, sullen men, suspicious already of all foreigners. I have outlined what I conceived to be American aims in Siberia and then have seen their sullenness dispelled. I am afraid, however, I did not represent American actions accurately, though I believe I did give American intentions accurately. I told them we wanted to show them American methods of railway operation, because greater efficiency meant more speed and quicker relief to their needy peasants. This policy they welcomed heartily enough, though they did not see it

in evidence when the Kolchakists were paralyzing the railway. I remember one committee meeting in Chita, where we had a delicate task, for the atmosphere was none too cordial. Before I had finished the chairman arose, an engineman named Kasacheff, a square-built, bullet-headed chap, and abruptly spoke: "All of you know that I am not much of a man to talk, for I believe in action. I have heard what the Americans have said at Irkutsk and here, and I merely want to tell you that I am for them first, last, and all the time." That was all, and that was enough.

Some months after that, when American troops had been sent out on the Trans-Siberian Railway to guard the line, there were one or two brushes with the Partisans, bands of peasants embittered at the atrocities committed by the Kolchak government and making guerilla attacks all over the country. The American troops had explicit orders to avoid hostilities with the Russians, and a private and unofficial meeting was held between representatives of the Partisans and American field officers. It was an unorthodox and interesting meeting. "We understand your position, and see why you are taking up arms," the Americans said in effect, though in more official phraseology, "but you must understand ours also. Our duty is to guard the railway. We have orders to do that, and we must obey them. So don't attack the railway in our district. If you do, we shall have to protect it by force. Do whatever else you believe to be your duty, but let the railway alone." The Russians acceded to this demand, and did not attack the railway—at least where there were American troops.

Though the Russians could understand our position in regard to the railway, they were pathetically bewildered by our support of Kolchak. "But you are Americans," they said to me again and again. "You have been fighting in the war for democracy. You are the greatest democracy in the world. That is all that Siberia wants—democracy. We only want what you have. Why don't you sympathize with us? Don't you see Kolchak and his kind stand for everything opposed to American ideals?" I never tried to explain the incongruity. I could not explain it to myself. I do not think it can be explained.

To the Kolchak fiasco and the support given it by the Allies may be traced all the evils that subsequently developed. This is not wisdom after the fact. I may say that the majority of those who knew Siberian conditions most intimately and had been longest on the scene and were without preconceived prejudices felt at the time that a mistake was being made, and those of us who were in official position said so. As American representative on an interallied organization I did say so repeatedly in my official dispatches.

The arrival of the allied troops was the signal for the reactionaries to mass and prepare to act. I have always supposed they knew they would get foreign support. On November 18, 1918, at any rate, they did act. They overthrew the democratic directorate at Omsk, and Kolchak was proclaimed supreme ruler.

It was not long before the true nature of the Kolchak government revealed itself. It did away at once with all the democratic organs of government, beginning with the Siberian Duma. Then it curbed the zemstvos, clapped censorship on press and speech and every other form of activity, and made arrests innumerable, which were always followed by secret military trials and the disappearance of the prisoners. The old black hundred of Czarist Russia—no, in truth, a worse power—was in the saddle. There was a modicum of law and justice and impersonality in the old capital; here there was unrestrained cruelty—the settling of personal grudges under cover of the law and indiscriminate extermination.

At this period, those two butchers, Ivanoff-Rinoff and Rozanoff, were in the full power of their activity, and on a larger scale Kalmukoff and Semenov. These men permitted their followers to torture their enemies, to brand them, gouge out their eyes, and whip them to death.SCRIPTION of peasants was declared, but the peasants took to the hills, for they hated the Kolchak régime violently for its outrages. For revenge those who did not escape and the relatives of those who did were taken, tortured, and murdered. I have pictures and records of the bodies of victims, many pictures of corpses lying near to the charred ruins of their homes. Undoubtedly such pictures are contained in the official files at Washington, and were there at that time—at the very time when we were working ourselves into a fury over Bolshevik atrocities and acclaiming Kolchak as savior of Russia from the red demon.

The Czechs were the first to show disaffection. They knew the Russian people and their dream of peaceful and democratic rule after their long agony. They knew the bitterness this cruel betrayal would work in them. The Czechs made formal protest, but although it was they who had done the fighting that kept the Bolshevik troops from swarming into Siberia, they were unheard. Some of the allied representatives joined in the protest. The railway committee, seeing the frustration of all its aims, sent telegrams to Kolchak and cablegrams to the home Governments. Both were of no avail. I myself cabled repeatedly to the State Department not only that the Kolchak government was acting in a way subversive of all decent government anywhere but that it was doomed, because it had alienated the population, and existed only by the strength of allied arms behind it.

But not until it was too late was any move made to apply pressure. In the spring of 1919, when the Allies were debating in Paris whether or not to recognize Kolchak, it was already apparent, only four or five months after he had declared himself supreme ruler, that he had so completely repelled the Siberian people that only a miracle or an enormous allied army could save him. To this ironic or tragic pass we had come: First, because of the personality of the highest allied representatives in Siberia; and, second, because of the poisoning of the world's mind with propaganda.

The allied representatives at Omsk were men drawn from the ultra-conservative ranks in their own countries. They naturally agreed with the Russian reactionaries that the only way to bring the Russians back to their senses was to rule them with a military dictatorship and to use measures stern but supposedly just. The allied military commanders reported to their Governments that all was well. General Janin, French commander, a thorough-going pro-interventionist, was outwardly pro-Kolchak. General Knox, British commander, was recognized as creator of the Kolchak government, and the man behind it. The Japanese were intent only on reaping a harvest for themselves and getting military control of the country, no matter at what cost of suffering. General Graves, American commander, possessed but limited authority. He was not to interfere in internal affairs. Besides, the American Government also was, at least half-heartedly, supporting the Kolchak government. I have only the highest admiration for the way General Graves discharged his duties. I am sure conditions would have been worse if he had not been there. And I think I can say that if General Graves ever empties his heart of his feelings concerning the American expedition to Siberia and what he saw, what we shall hear will tincture a little with shame our pride in the part we played in the war in Siberia.

Siberia was the largest well from which was drawn the poison that crazed the mind of the world on Russia between 1918 and 1921. The Russian reactionary agents, ignoring the fact that not more than 5 per cent of the Russian people were of Bolshevik tendency, painted allied citizens in Siberia and through them to the allied people at home such picture that the world visualized Russia as a country of raving communists with a bomb in one hand and a firebrand in the other. Those of us who were living in the Siberian part of Russia all this time and hearing of these terrors always in some other city than the one in which we happened to be, saw soon enough what were the sources of the propaganda and the motives for it.

The end of Kolchak's power came quickly. The Siberians rose against him, dispersed such of his troops as had not deserted, overthrew his government, captured him, and put him to death.

Meanwhile the Japanese had already taken advantage of conditions ideally suited to imperialist profiteering in Siberia. Evidence accumulated early to indicate that the Japanese military were backing individual aspirants to Siberian supremacy. When Rozanoff, who had butchered with obscene bestiality, was defeated and had to flee for his life, he was given shelter by the Japanese military command.

The Japanese military were shrewd enough to know that they could never hold so huge an area as Siberia. They determined instead on a policy of holding a few strategic points. To do so they would have to make terms with local chieftains. Rozanoff, Kalmykoff, and Semenovoff were their first tools, and the worst of these was Semenovoff. Since that time they have had to restrict their scope even more, because the world has begun to look a little too sharply at events in Siberia. They have determined therefore on a policy of holding all the means of ingress into Siberia, and they do hold them. They have Sakhalen, which commands the mouth of the Amur in the north, Vladivostok, the principal port, and Dairen, a China coast port. To those points, which they hold as they do everything else they have obtained in Siberia, by means of their Russian tools, they have had to recede. Those points, however, are sufficient to constitute the mastery of Siberia for all practical purposes.

The allied expedition had not been long under way before we realized that it had two aspects: One Russian, and the other Japanese. I can say from my own official experience that the latter was the more difficult and the more troublesome. Everybody knows now that although the Japanese Government and the American Government agreed to send 7,500 troops each into Siberia, Japan in a few months had poured in 70,000 or more. From that time forward every allied object met with Japanese obstruction in an indirect, oblique, maddening form. "Cherchez le Japonais" became the rule of action, at least in the interallied railway committee, no matter what happened. The greatest disorders, the most awkward obstacles in the way of the objects of the committee, were always in the territory controlled by one of the Japanese-supported Russian generals, usually Semenovoff. It was interesting that when the Allies allotted the stretches of the Trans-Siberian Railway that the forces of each were to guard, the Japanese chose the section under Semenovoff's control. And when the Japanese were requested by the committee to compel Semenovoff to cease disorganizing traffic on the railway and pillaging towns along the railway they replied that they could not "interfere." Yet when anti-Semenovoff Russian forces threatened to enter Semenovoff territory they could always stop them. And it was interesting that Semenovoff's acts always produced results in harmony with results that the Japanese wanted to accomplish, and that Semenovoff's money was always Japanese yen. The Japanese could not interfere and did not attempt to interfere in Russian internal affairs. It was known that a guard of Japanese troops was stationed around Semenovoff's house in Chita, and Japanese officers lived in his house. Once during an American official call, made nominally to pay respects, but really to sound him on his intentions, he said, for he never really has disliked Americans: "Be careful. There are Japanese in the next room. They overhear everything I say and watch everything I do."

There is special American interest in Semenovoff now, because at the time of writing he has just been granted permission to enter America. Having become a marked man he has outlived his usefulness to the Japanese.

I first met him in March, 1918, in a modest room in a Harbin hotel. He was then unspoiled, a Cossack captain of medium height and build, with no outstanding physical characteristics. In fact, with a quiet voice and colorless manner he gave little indication of the horrible part he was to play. He told me of his plan of action against the Bolsheviks and his aim to make conditions favorable for a democratic régime. All the Allies were then supporting him, but when he showed his character, all but the Japanese dropped him. Two months later he made another trip to Harbin. He was then drunk with power, and soon he was drunk with the conventional intoxicant. He painted Harbin red—redder than it usually is. From that time he degenerated, officially and personally.

He accumulated wives here and there—among them the famous Mascha, once humble danseuse of the Café Palermo, who he gauded with diamonds bought with yen—and the wives and his other habits required money. And the more money and the more power Semenovoff got, both through Japan, the drunker with power and wine he became, and the more barbarous. He shot up towns, leaving the dead in his path, and looted them of all valuables, apparently for mere sport. And the Japanese never interfered with his pastimes. I do not suppose they really approved of all his activities, but they allowed him his savagery because he did their political bidding, and he was willing to do their political bidding in exchange for protection while he went on with his atrocities and profited by them. Yet he never really trusted the Japanese, as the incident I have told illustrates. But he needed them. For now and then he overstepped his bounds and had to flee. He never had stomach for fighting; in fact, he was always conspicuous for his remoteness from the region of battle. And when he fled he found it convenient to take refuge in Japanese territory, either in Siberia or on the China coast, where Japan has territory. When he returned from his Japanese asylum he always bought his ruble exchange with Japanese yen.

The most illuminating illustration of Japanese methods was the manner in which they used Semenovoff to obstruct the Czech evacuation. It was to protect the Czechs in their evacuation, remember, that the Allies entered Siberia. The Czechs played a heroic part until they were revolted by Kolchak's oppressions. When they found that protest was futile they decided to avail themselves of the permission previously granted them to leave. But Kolchak did not want them to go, for they were his chief support; and the Japanese did not want them to, for if they did then the Japanese themselves would have no reason for staying. So they hired Semenovoff to hinder the proposed withdrawal.

Finally the Czechs threatened to force their way through. So serious did the situation become that the interallied committee had to take cognizance of it, and on a French proposal I was authorized by the committee, including the Japanese member, to go to Chita with full power to arrange for the evacuation. On my arrival I found a Japanese-dominated committee acting on the matter—or rather, not acting. I presented my credentials and was told by General Hoshino, the Japanese chairman of the committee, that he had not heard of my appointment. I soon got confirmation from Vladivostok, so the Japanese set out by other means to delay the Czechs.

They resorted to a multitude of petty obstructions. They left locomotives on the main tracks at big stations to hold up Czech trains. They offered excuses that rolling stock and locomotives needed repair. If the Czechs offered to send their own mechanics into the shops, the Japanese replied that they would have to have Japanese workmen, who would soon be there. The Japanese workmen never came.

One night in Chita the Semenovoffites blocked all the tracks leading into the city just before the arrival of one of the fighting echelons from the west. The Czechs demanded entry. The Semenovoffites refused. Then the Japanese ordered out 800 troops and two pieces of artillery, which they placed outside the station. The Czech commander, not knowing the cause of the delay, came into the city on foot. He took one look and then sent a notification to both the Semenovoff officers and the Japanese that at 8 o'clock the next morning he intended to enter. Semenovoffites and Japanese both understood. They knew the Czech mettle. They knew that the commander would come in or fight. They withdrew. Naturally, the Japanese did not want to fight. That would be advertising to the world that they were fighting the very men they were in Siberia to protect.

In the meantime the Japanese were busy with their own exclusive enterprises. They sent detachments of troops to all the principal stations along the Chinese Eastern Railway, which the Chinese had been commissioned to guard. The Chinese protested to the Allied Railway Technical Board and to the allied commanders. The Japanese explained to both that the troops were there merely to keep the telegraph line to Chita in repair. They said further that they would make no change in the guarding of the railway, but that anyhow this was a matter for them to settle with the Chinese separately. It must be remembered that the Peking Government at that time was in the hands of Japanese agents. It must also be remembered that the Chinese Eastern Railway is the southeastern loop that connects the trans-Siberian line with the Chinese coast, and therefore commands North Manchuria.

About the same time—the spring of 1919—the Japanese sent troops to Nikolaevsk, on the Amur River, although there had been no agreement with the Allies to do so, and there were no railways to guard within 400 miles. They explained in defense that they had to protect their fisheries in the coastal region around Nikolaevsk. Why the navy could not do this work they never explained. As a matter of fact, they wanted to hold the mouth of the Amur, the great channel of water communication in north Siberia. At Nikolaevsk occurred the massacre of 700 Japanese, in reprisal for which the Japanese have seized the southern island of Sakhalen with its wealth of resources. The Japanese have never brought out the fact that their garrison was in Nikolaevsk without permission or lawful right, nor do they tell what their troops did to the Siberians there before the latter retaliated.

It is necessary to cite, as one more instance of Japanese methods, the first seizure of Vladivostok. On April 1, 1920, the last of the American troops sailed. The other allied troops had already gone. There were left only the Japanese. Three days after the Americans had gone the Japanese seized Vladivostok and then Khabarovsk and Nikolsk. And then they sent dispatches all over the world saying they had been attacked. But on my return a few days later—I had been west with the Czechs—not a bullet mark could be found on the building occupied by the Japanese troops, though the near-by buildings occupied by the Russian military were riddled. So it was wherever there had been fighting. It would seem strange that the Japanese should be attacked simultaneously in three widely separated cities; that all the casualties should be Russian; that the Japanese should be ready to put up signs in Japanese characters with the names of all the stations on the railway between Nikolsk and Vladivostok, and that suddenly troops should be found all along the railway.

What events like these meant to the Russians I can best tell by a concrete case. In Nikolsk there was a Russian school-teacher named Polnshkin. He was also secretary of the Railway Club, housed in a building that had been seized by the Japanese military. As secretary he went to the club to get some papers. By several people he was seen entering. He was never seen to come out. He was never seen again. The affair was reported by the Russians to the American railway inspectors in Nikolsk. They asked the Japanese chief of gendarmerie to investigate. He denied that the man had ever come into the building. The affair was then reported to the Interallied Railway Committee, which could find out nothing.

Through this entire period there came reports from our technical board in Harbin of demoralization of the Chinese Eastern Railway by the Japanese. Trains were being stopped, sent back, held for long intervals. Russians were being arrested and executed without trial. Men were beaten. Private residences were searched. Everywhere terror reigned. The Japanese had seized upon the excuse that they had to protect Korea and China from Bolshevism, which the American press swallowed, and then they sent Semenovoff, Kalmykoff, and other Russian employees off on sacking expeditions to prove that there was disorder in the country.

The effect on the Siberians can be imagined. They were goaded to fury, the more frantic for being helpless. In constant dread, submitted to every indignity and outrage, they took their revenge, where they could, by boycotting Japanese goods. For, remember, the Japanese brought in thousands of merchants and exploiters as their clutch tightened, and simultaneously they prevented business men of other nationalities from shipping their goods on the railway.

On one occasion the Russian railway workers threatened to strike in protest against the way they were treated by the Japanese. Mr. Matsudaira, the Japanese member of the railway committee, came to me and asked me to intercede, knowing that I spoke Russian and had the confidence of the workers. I went to them and finally dissuaded them from striking, on the plea that all would suffer if the railway ceased operations. When I reported my success to Mr. Matsudaira he told me he should like to talk to one of the workmen directly and pressed me to arrange an interview. I asked the head of the switchmen's union if he would talk to Mr. Matsudaira. He consented, and I brought him to my office and called Mr. Matsudaira.

Mr. Matsudaira asked why the Russians were so opposed to the Japanese. "For three reasons," said the Russian; "because of the

undemocratic government of Japan, and because of the brutalities of Japanese intervention, and because of the Japanese treatment of Korea." Mr. Matsudaira admitted that Japan was not a democratic country and that the army was not under the control of the civil government, but he said that Japan would soon be democratic. He made rather a lame explanation of the intervention and was silent on Korea. He then asked the Russian to come to his house. The Russian hesitated a moment and then spoke to me in Russian, which Mr. Matsudaira did not understand. "Should I go?" he asked. I asked him why not. He said he feared that it was a ruse to trap him and that he would be arrested. I explained to Mr. Matsudaira, who looked embarrassed and then wrote out a safe-conduct on his visiting card.

A few days later I met the Russian and asked him how he had fared on his visit. Mr. Matsudaira, he said, had argued with him lengthily and then asked him to go to the Russian workmen and tell them that Japan was all right.

"Did you?" I asked.

"No."

"Why not?"

"Because I don't want to be hanged by my own people."

Now I want to make one point clear. I do not think the reprehensible policy of the Japanese military was the expression of the unanimous will of the Japanese. I have had evidence to the contrary. I know, for instance, that, at sessions of the Interallied Railway Committee, Mr. Matsudaira himself frequently squirmed when confronted by the fact that the army had violated his promises. I know that at times he intervened with the military to call them off some outstandingly evil project. I have had one of the foremost publicists speak condemningly to me of the actions of the Japanese military.

Once in Harbin, while I was reading in my private car, in which I lived, a Japanese in a colonel's uniform entered. "I will not tell you my name," he said, "for I should be ruined if this were known, but I want to tell you that there are some of us who are ashamed of the conduct of our representatives here and that it does not typify our people. We ought to get out and leave these Russians alone. I can not give you my name, but you may tell your Government what I have said."

Less dramatic but more enlightening and promising was a visit I had from a representative of the Bank of Japan, accompanied by a Japanese foreign office man. They came to protest against the conduct of their own army and asked me to protest also to my Government in the strongest possible terms. I told them I usually did.

Another man of wide financial interests came to me once and said: "We are trying to enlist the help of America. We are trying to abolish in our country the graft that ruined China and Russia, too."

"I can tell you our largest business houses all feel the same way. Our very Army officers here are engaged in corruption, besides following a line of conduct that can only make us enemies in Russia. We want you to fight the military all you can." By way of proving his sincerity he told me of definite cases of corrupt deals then under way involving the military clique and certain business firms. I had heard something of these matters before. He confirmed the information I had that certain officers of high rank were helping Japanese business companies with political connections to evade customs duties on commercial shipments into Siberia. Through him also I obtained a hint that commercial shipments were entering the country as Red Cross supplies with the connivance of military officers.

I had later a specific instance of this kind of trickery from an American, who told me of a Russian firm that refused his orders because the Japanese underbid him. He was curious to know how such a thing was possible. The Russian showed him goods that had come in cases marked with the Red Cross stamp.

"Why can't you do this?" the Russian asked.

I should add that I reported this whole matter to Mr. Matsudaira and that he immediately took steps to prevent the dishonest practices of Japanese importers.

Let me say in conclusion just why and how the Siberian question is of practical, immediate importance to Americans. It concerns our commerce now—our legitimate commerce. Just before I left Siberia there arrived in Vladivostok a 12-car shipment of hardware consigned to a Russian importer in the west. When the American agent tried to have the goods shipped he was balked. The Japanese would not give him the cars. One carload left immediately, because that contained a small Japanese order. The remainder of the shipment was held up for two months.

A little later there came a British consignment of cable. It, too, eventually got through, but only after long delay. The Japanese insisted and still insist that no trains shall leave Vladivostok without their permission. How long British and American competitors could hold out under such conditions experience in Dairen, Tsingtao, Port Arthur, and other Japanese-controlled ports proves.

In Siberia, as in China, there is hope in the existence of a class of Japanese who feel as do some of the minority I have cited, but this class, though liberal, is now decidedly in the minority and powerless. It can but slightly mitigate the evils of the nature of the Japanese occupation and of the occupation itself. So long as the Japanese are in Siberia there must be trouble. Until they leave a real Siberian government can not possibly be established. Tramped-up revolutions will be unceasing, and each will bring its loss of life and property. This is the real crime of the Japanese occupation. But I would not seem to lay the crime at Japanese doors exclusively. I have tried to point out that the European allies and America must share the guilt. That is the real tragedy of Siberia.

THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7456) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). The next amendment of the Committee on Finance will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 9, before the word "cents," to strike out the numeral "2" and insert "1½," so as to read:

Boric acid, 1½ cents per pound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I am a little at a loss to understand why the chairman of the Finance Committee remained silent and would permit this amendment to be adopted without any statement or any information as to why it should be made.

Under the present law this article, boric acid, is taxed three-fourths of a cent a pound. The House, in the bill which it passed, increased that duty to 2 cents per pound. The majority of the Finance Committee fixed the duty at 1½ cents per pound. The item is now reached for a vote, and there is not a word from the Finance Committee regarding it.

In the report which the Finance Committee submitted to the Senate with this bill no reference was made to this item. There is not one word of testimony in the hearings of the Finance Committee regarding it. The item is not even mentioned in all of the hearings taken by the Finance Committee.

I can not imagine how this course is going to be acceptable to the Senate. I can not construe it in any other way than that the Finance Committee expects the Senate to ratify what it proposes, regardless of any information on the subject. If that is what is expected by the majority of the Finance Committee, the country ought to know it now. The country ought to be advised as to what the Senate is expected to do in regard to this great taxation measure, and the underlying reason for imposing the tax upon the consumers of this country.

To me, Mr. President, this can not be viewed in a commendatory light. Is that what we are to be subjected to with regard to every item in this bill? I did not take the floor until after the chairman was practically going to consider this amendment adopted without any objection. The chairman of the Finance Committee made no attempt to give any explanation or any information about it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me for a few moments?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

ATTORNEY GENERAL DAUGHERTY.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I had hoped not to take any more time in the discussion of matters not relating directly to the bill before the Senate, but I rise now merely to ask that the Attorney General, Mr. Daugherty, come to the rescue of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I have no doubt but that the Attorney General told the Senator from Indiana that he, the Attorney General, was not connected with the procuring of a pardon for Morse, and received no compensation for services in that matter. I am sure that he told him that, or the Senator from Indiana would not have made the statement Tuesday on the floor. Since there is a question of veracity between the Senator from Indiana and the Attorney General, as I shall show in a minute, I want the Attorney General, if he will not set himself right with the people, at least to set the Senator from Indiana, who came so nobly to his rescue last Tuesday, right before the public. The Senator from Indiana was misled by the Attorney General, and the Attorney General ought to have consideration enough for his friends to come forward and admit that he misled the Senator from Indiana, because after this commutation of Morse was granted, in 1912, by Mr. Taft, the present Chief Justice, before he went out of office by unanimous consent as President, the present Attorney General gave out an interview, published in a local paper in Columbus, Ohio, and it should have been a matter with which the junior Senator from Ohio was familiar yesterday when he spoke, but he has evidently forgotten it. In that interview the Attorney General took credit—I use the word because he seemed to think that credit was what he was entitled to receive—for having procured the pardon of Morse.

Let me read, first, the statements made to Mr. Taft. I know that Chief Justice Taft, who was President, thought he was pardoning a man who was afflicted with a fatal malady. As one Republican Senator told me—though I am not at liberty to give his name—all he had against Morse was that he jumped his bond; that he gave bond that he would die in six months, and is alive yet, and the Senator feels aggrieved. But Taft said in an interview:

In my opinion the prisoner's duration of life will, in all probability, be less than one month if kept in confinement, and in the event of his release under commutation of sentence, it is not probable that he will live as long as six months.

That was in 1912, and it seems that he will go down there to get another certificate that he has a fatal malady from the same doctor who gave him this one. Mr. Daugherty has made that possible by appointing this doctor to the same place he occupied then. Nothing like having your friends in a position where they can prove helpful.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, Charles W. Morse himself said that he had only a few days to live, and that all he asked the President to do was to let him die outside of the penitentiary, so that he would not leave the stigma upon his wife and child of having died inside of the penitentiary, unpardoned.

Mr. CARAWAY. He is still alive?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. It seems so.

Mr. CARAWAY. On the following day after his pardon there appeared in the Columbus Dispatch, with which, I presume, the Senator from Ohio is familiar, an afternoon paper published in Mr. Daugherty's home town, whose representative had, apparently, just interviewed him, a story under the following headlines:

Morse owes his commutation to Harry Daugherty.

That is the present Attorney General. This is in quotation marks, showing that this is what the Attorney General said:

Succeeded after efforts of other attorneys had been of no avail.

The paper said:

Mr. Daugherty convinced the President through the Attorney General (George W. Wickersham) that Mr. Morse has but a few months to live, and the President thereupon commuted the banker's sentence, so he could be released at once.

Here is what Mr. Daugherty said. It is in quotation marks. It quotes Mr. Daugherty thus:

My interest in the case was not as an attorney to get Mr. Morse's freedom but representing a number of certificate holders in a steamship company interested with Mr. Morse. Mr. Morse's attorneys in Atlanta are Anderson, Felder, Roundtree & Wilson, a firm with which our firm has had considerable business, and we became interested through them.

About \$2,000,000 is involved in having the affairs of these certificate holders straightened out satisfactorily, and unless they could get the advantage of Mr. Morse's aid—for he is a genius and a wizard—

I understand that was what he was called when he organized the Ice Trust in New York and caused the death of dozens of poor people. I repeat:

And unless they could get the advantage of Mr. Morse's aid—for he is a genius and a wizard—a lot of innocent people would suffer. His health was such that it was necessary to get him in a position to assist us as soon as possible. The President said a year ago when efforts were made to get a pardon for Morse that he would not consider the case again until January 1, 1913, but by that time Morse will be dead.

So I went to Washington and laid the facts before Secretary of War Stimson and before the Attorney General and Judge Hough, the trial judge. Mr. Wickersham was opposed to taking any action whatever the first time I saw him, but the facts were presented to him so completely that he took the matter up, had examinations made by Government physicians, and then laid the matter before the President. The President personally sent a Government physician to make an examination and report to him, then commuted the sentence.

Morse was sent to the penitentiary as the result of a bank war in New York City. There were three or four examinations of his bank, and all reported everything O. K., but still another man was sent to make another examination and he made the report that caused the trouble.

Morse's violation of the law was entirely technical.

That was what Mr. Daugherty said about it. So he should not have misled the Senator from Indiana and have him pledge his word as a Senator that Morse was pardoned without any assistance from Daugherty, because Daugherty entered a plea of guilty in the matter 10 years ago.

But there is another matter to be straightened out, Mr. President. A man came here to see me yesterday, whose graphic picture was painted in the record by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Watson], and I want to read just a line or two of it to have it fresh in our minds, especially because I am going to read a letter from Mr. Felder, in which he intimates somebody is going to be responsible for anything that is said against his character—and I am going to say something against it—and I want to draw his picture. Here it is as painted by a man who lives in Georgia and who knows him. This is from Senator WATSON of Georgia:

Mr. President, for the last 40 years I have known Thomas B. Felder well, and I have known him to be a crook. I know him to have been a professional lobbyist of the whisky ring, opposing every one of the temperance laws that I was advocating and other temperance people were advocating in Georgia. He combated us at every step. We had to close the barrooms over his protest; and he never ceased to be a lobbyist in Georgia until the attack made upon him by myself and by others destroyed his usefulness as a lobbyist. Then he left the State and went to New York.

I would not say this here if I had not said it to his face in a State convention in Atlanta. I denounced him to his face in that convention, and he turned about as white as a piece of paper and did not open his mouth. I am asserting a fact in saying that he was not a lawyer, but a lobbyist; not an honest man, but a knave; not a witness whom anybody would believe, but a man who, in the State of Georgia, would be impeached if offered as a witness on the trial of a case by men of the highest standing and character, who would say that from their general knowledge of his character they would not believe him on oath.

Mr. Felder intimates in the letter that if anybody says anything about him, trouble is brewing. If so, here is where I kiss good-by to all my dear relatives, I reckon. I would be glad, if Mr. Felder feels so inclined, because I shall not put it in the record, to have him tell what I said to him yesterday when he approached me about this case and made a statement that I knew was not true. He is at liberty and has my permission, and I will take my chances on getting churchd for having said it.

But this man wrote me a letter. If I would not let him talk with me, he is going to communicate with me, and I want to read his letter, but will first say this: I am sure that he thinks that if Judas Iscariot had left a kindly mention of the devil in his memoirs the devil would have been in good standing to-day, because he rushes to the defense of the Attorney General, and therefore thinks he washes the Attorney General whiter than snow.

Here is his letter, leaving off the salutation:

It is inconceivable to me that a Senator who fairly represents the people of the great State of Arkansas could under even the temptation of partisan politics assail a distinguished member of the official family of the President of the United States. The statement made by you that Charles W. Morse ever at any time or under any circumstances paid Hon. Harry M. Daugherty \$25,000 to get him out of the penitentiary is absolutely without any foundation in fact.

How much he did pay he does not say. The amount is not of any consequence. The question is, Did he act for Morse?

At the time Charles W. Morse was serving sentence in the Atlanta Penitentiary I was a member of the Atlanta (Ga.) bar. I was attorney for Fred L. Seeley and his interests, including the Atlanta Georgian, Mr. Seeley was essentially a philanthropist.

I understood eventually he was also something of a skinner and left Georgia for Georgia's good.

He became sentimentally interested in the fate of Charles W. Morse. He employed me to examine fully the case and determine if upon the merits he was entitled to Executive clemency. I reached the conclusion that the penalty was excessive, in view of the fact that the court of appeals had reversed the lower court on several of the counts in the indictment. I was requested to proceed with the case.

Now, here is the interesting part of the letter:

I told my client that the case was a very important one; that my acquaintance in official circles was circumscribed; that I knew an attorney in Columbus, Ohio, with whom I had been associated both personally and professionally—

He is the man whom Felder, whose picture I have just reproduced, says he knew—

I knew an attorney in Columbus, Ohio, with whom I had been associated both personally and professionally, who possessed in an eminent degree not only ability—

I presume he means for this particular kind of work—

but character, which entitled and gave him the confidence and respect of officials who had to do with the case.

That was President Taft and his official family.

He authorized me to employ him. We proceeded with the case.

Now, Mr. President, I say again the Attorney General ought to apologize to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson] for having misled him, because here is this man stating that he hired him.

Morse was pardoned. I, as leading counsel in the case, directed step by step the policies pursued by and with the advice of my associate—

By and with the advice of his associate, who is the present Attorney General.

If anything irregular was done I am solely responsible. If anything irregular is charged to me by anyone at any time I will take care of that situation.

A tiny little threat.

I dislike to take part in political bickerings and wranglings. I like a calm, placid life.

I should like to recommend him, if he enjoys that kind of a life, that he go back to South Carolina, where he was under indictment and where he might have gotten it. But apparently he did not care for a calm and placid life of that particular kind.

But I have sat mute and listened to the vile and baseless insinuations uttered against this great and good man whom I personally know would not under any temptation so far forget either his manhood or his honor as to do an unethical, much less corrupt, professional act. I feel that even without his consent I must break the silence.

Very truly yours,

THOS. B. FELDER.

Well, Daugherty said he got into the case because he wanted Morse for a witness. Felder says he got into the case because he hired him to help a philanthropist to get Morse out. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson] said he was not in the case at all.

Now I want to say this, Mr. President, that whether the Attorney General ought to have done this thing as a practicing attorney, I am not passing judgment. In fact, that was only secondary when I came into the controversy. I was merely trying to show how helpless these children were to get a pardon,

because they did not have an attorney, and how successful crooks were in getting pardoned where they were able to hire attorneys, and the Senator from Indiana rushed to the defense of the Attorney General and said that I was wrongfully charging Attorney General Daugherty, and that he had nothing to do with it.

Frankly, I had never investigated it. I had heard it referred to so often and never denied that I presumed it was true, but since the Senator from Indiana saw fit to deny it and so emphatically, and the Attorney General then came out in an interview in which he intended to be insulting and was in a way, although I am not much hurt by it, and since I then was approached by this "good" man from Georgia, Mr. Thomas B. Felder, who was a lobbyist, and I have it on the information of men who are perfectly willing to stand up and tell it at any time that he was not only a lobbyist for the whisky ring but he was a lobbyist of the kind which least commands the respect of anyone—he was a lobbyist against every attempt of the legislature to strike the fetters from the wrists of little children by enacting laws that would relieve children from the burdensome and unjust imposition put upon them of employing them in factories, where they were compelled to work when they should have been in school.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I did not hear all of the colloquy between the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Indiana, but I read it rather hastily. My recollection is that the Senator from Indiana, who unfortunately is not here at the moment—

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, before the Senator goes further let me say that I told the Senator from Indiana that I had the matter and was going to bring it up. He had full knowledge of it.

Mr. WILLIS. What I was about to say is that, as I recall the colloquy, the Senator from Indiana did not say Mr. Daugherty had nothing to do with the case, but he did say that Mr. Daugherty did not get \$25,000, or any other sum, as a fee in the case. That is the way I recall the colloquy.

Mr. CARAWAY. No; if the Senator will read it some time, he will find that after he qualified his first statement he did state it as I have stated it. The first statement was that Daugherty had nothing to do with it. I want to say now that I do not want to be put in the attitude of criticizing the Senator from Indiana, because he was repeating what he was told; and I am not overly criticizing the Attorney General. I am just talking about him. I presume he is a good enough Attorney General for this administration. The President knew all about him before he was appointed, and I am not expecting him to be gotten rid of.

But that is not the idea I have in discussing the matter at all. The defense of the Attorney General was so heated that it left an implication in the minds of some people that I was accusing him of having done something of which he was not guilty. I say to the Senator from Ohio, and I say to the Senator from Indiana and to the Attorney General, that I do not care whether he got \$25,000 or 25 cents. I do not care whether the story that has been told this morning is true or not—that Morse never paid him, and therefore that Morse is going to be sent back to the penitentiary; I do not care whether that is true or not. I do not care whether he got a nickel or got \$25,000, or whether Morse paid him or promised to pay him and did not pay him. I will say, however, that I rather imagine I shall be able to put in the RECORD some receipts, but I will wait until some more defenses are made, and I will print them a little bit later.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I know the Senator desires to be accurate. I refer him to page 6726 of the RECORD, which sets forth the colloquy between the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Indiana. Down past the middle of the page the Senator from Indiana said:

I did not say that he did not represent Morse; but I say on my knowledge of the situation that he received no fee for the service rendered, nor did he represent Morse directly, according to my understanding.

Mr. CARAWAY. What did he say just previous to that?

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator desire me to read it to him?

Mr. CARAWAY. No; I just want the Senator to read it for his own information.

Mr. WILLIS. I have read it all.

Mr. CARAWAY. No; the Senator has not read half of the colloquy.

Mr. WILLIS. I have read what precedes that, and what pertains to this matter. Will the Senator from Arkansas refer me to the place in the RECORD where the Senator from Indiana makes a contrary statement?

Mr. CARAWAY. No; but the Senator can read it himself.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator was asking to have it read. Here is what the Senator from Indiana said:

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. Does the Senator charge on his responsibility as a Senator that Mr. Daugherty, even before he was Attorney General, received a fee for helping to get Mr. Morse out of the penitentiary?

Mr. CARAWAY. I charged that that was a matter of public information. I was not, of course, present when any contract was made. I will say that I have heard it so often that I think it is true, without question.

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. The Senator, then, accepts a rumor as true, and charges it on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. CARAWAY. Does the Senator from Indiana say that it is not true?

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. I do.

Mr. CARAWAY. On the Senator's own personal knowledge?

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. I do.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir. Everybody, including the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS], knew that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] intended in that statement to say that Daugherty was not employed in that case.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah has not expressed any opinion in reference to the matter; he knows nothing about it; but he simply read what transpired in the Senate between the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. CARAWAY. I know. I know what everybody understood that the Senator from Indiana was intending to say—that there was no relation between Daugherty and this man.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. He further says that there was.

Mr. CARAWAY. I know he did later; I have stated that two or three times.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the Senator from Arkansas point out any such language in the RECORD that was used by the Senator from Indiana? I know the Senator from Arkansas wants to be fair. Where did the Senator from Indiana say anything such as the Senator from Arkansas now attributes to him?

Mr. CARAWAY. Let me read it to the Senator, laying all heat aside, for I have not any.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator from Arkansas will find the statement of the Senator from Indiana on page 6175, and I trust he will read it all.

Mr. CARAWAY. When the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] rose he first said:

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. We did not hear over on this side what it was that the Senator said about the Attorney General. Will he kindly repeat it?

Mr. CARAWAY. I know the Senator did not hear it, because all the Senators over there got busy in order not to hear what was being said. I said that I understood that the greatest achievement of the Attorney General was that he got a pardon for a criminal, and got a fee of \$25,000 for doing it.

The charge was that he got a pardon for a criminal and that incidentally he got a fee of \$25,000. The fee, whether he got a nickel or a million dollars, was not important; everybody understood that. The question was whether he got a pardon. That is what the controversy was about. The Senator from Indiana further said:

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. Does the Senator mean since he became Attorney General?

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, no.

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. May I further question the Senator?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. To what case does the Senator refer?

Mr. CARAWAY. The Morse case.

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. Does the Senator charge on his responsibility as a Senator that Mr. Daugherty, even before he was Attorney General, received a fee for helping to get Mr. Morse out of the penitentiary?

Mr. CARAWAY. I charged that that was a matter of public information. I was not, of course, present when any contract was made. I will say that I have heard it so often that I think it is true, without question.

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. The Senator, then, accepts a rumor as true, and charges it on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. CARAWAY. Does the Senator from Indiana say that it is not true?

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. That related to the fee.

Mr. CARAWAY. That related to the fee. The important question is not what fee he got, and I am not going off on a side issue like that, but did he help get the pardon? That was all I had in view. As I have said before, I was only incidentally criticizing the Attorney General. I had no quarrel with him then, and I have not any now. If I should do the Senator from Indiana an injustice, nobody would be quicker than I to admit it; but I understood the Senator at first to intend to say that the Attorney General had nothing to do with it. He then over and again quibbled about whether he was directly or indirectly em-

played. That is my understanding from his language. I want to be fair with him, and I will quote further from the Record. Afterwards I asked:

On the Senator's own personal knowledge?

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. I do.

Mr. CARAWAY. That Mr. Daugherty did not represent Morse?

Mr. WATSON. I did not say that he did not represent Morse; but I say on my knowledge of the situation that he received no fee for the service rendered, nor did he represent Morse directly, according to my understanding.

Mr. CARAWAY. Did he indirectly represent him?

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. No.

Mr. CARAWAY. Why did the Senator say, then, that he did not directly represent him?

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. I meant by that that my understanding of the situation is that he was representing his client, and that the testimony of Mr. Morse was necessary, and that in that way he had contact with Mr. Morse; but he did not get him out of the penitentiary; he had not anything to do with getting him out of the penitentiary; and he received no fee for getting him out of the penitentiary.

That is absolutely plain. That is what the Senator from Indiana said. Even the Senator from Utah will bear me out now that he denied that the Attorney General had anything to do with getting Morse out of the penitentiary, did he not?

Mr. SMOOT. I never made any statement that he did not.

Mr. CARAWAY. Then I misunderstood the Senator from Utah. The Senator from Ohio evidently had not read this. I would not want to misrepresent the Senator from Indiana, and I will read it again. The Senator from Indiana said:

I meant by that that my understanding of the situation is—

And he said he obtained his information from conversations with the Attorney General—

that he was representing his client, and that the testimony of Mr. Morse was necessary, and that in that way he had contact with Mr. Morse; but he did not get him out of the penitentiary; he had not anything to do with getting him out of the penitentiary; and he received no fee for getting him out of the penitentiary.

That was the statement of the Senator from Indiana, was it not? I am sure the Senator from Ohio will bear me out in that.

Mr. WILLIS. I have no doubt the Senator from Arkansas has read correctly.

Mr. CARAWAY. But the Senator from Ohio had overlooked what I have just read.

Mr. WILLIS. I had not overlooked it. I merely want to straighten out the controversy between the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CARAWAY. I thought the Senator from Ohio said that the Attorney General did not have anything to do with it.

Mr. WILLIS. I did not say anything of that kind.

Mr. CARAWAY. I thought the Senator from Ohio said that the Senator from Indiana said—but I will not quote the Senator from Ohio because he said he did not know anything about it.

What I have read was the positive statement of the Senator from Indiana, that the present Attorney General had nothing to do with it, and he said that that statement was based upon a statement made by the Attorney General to him.

The Attorney General, however, gave out an interview in 1917, in which he said that he obtained the pardon; that others had failed, but that he had succeeded. It is true he said in that instance that he wanted to use Mr. Morse as a witness to help straighten out some matters, or rather, to get the advantage of his business genius to help him straighten out some matters before Morse should die in the week or 10 days that he had to live; but now comes the bosom friend of the Attorney General, a man who can not sit still when anything is said against the Attorney General, a man who knows all the facts, a man to whom the honor of the Attorney General is so sacred that if anybody says anything about him he is going to settle with him later—and I am perfectly willing—and says that I was employed, that I got the pardon, advised and assisted by the present Attorney General.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator state again to the Senate his opinion of the reputation of the man to whom he has referred by name for truth and veracity? Does he believe him?

Mr. CARAWAY. His reputation is that he was a common liar, but his relations with the Attorney General are so close that he can not stand to hear him mentioned without rushing to his rescue. They are bosom friends, and the Attorney General in his interview said he was his associate. If the Attorney General wants to select that sort of people for his representatives and his associates, both socially and professionally, the Attorney General is entirely at liberty to choose his friends where he will. I do not care as to that; I am not an applicant for a seat in the circle.

Now, I wish to say in conclusion—

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator has been commenting upon a letter received by him. I did not get the name of the signer. Will the Senator give it?

Mr. CARAWAY. I will, and I will say he could have been mighty useful to the Senator when he was organizing Georgia some years ago. His name is Thomas B. Felder. I will put the letter in the Record, so that there may be no question about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The letter referred to is as follows:

MAY 3, 1922.

HON. T. H. CARAWAY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is inconceivable to me that a Senator who fairly represents the people of the great State of Arkansas could under even the temptation of partisan politics assail a distinguished member of the official family of the President of the United States. The statement made by you that Charles W. Morse ever at any time or under any circumstances paid Hon. Harry M. Daugherty \$25,000 to get him out of the penitentiary is absolutely without any foundation in fact.

At the time Charles W. Morse was serving a sentence in the Atlanta penitentiary I was a member of the Atlanta (Ga.) bar. I was attorney for Fred L. Seeley and his interests, including the Atlanta Georgian. Mr. Seeley was essentially a philanthropist. He became sentimentally interested in the fate of Charles W. Morse. He employed me to examine fully the case and to determine if upon the merits he was entitled to Executive clemency. I reached the conclusion that the penalty was excessive, in view of the fact that the court of appeals had reversed the lower court on several of the counts in the indictment. I was requested to proceed with the case.

I told my client that the case was a very important one; that my acquaintance in official circles was circumscribed; that I knew an attorney in Columbus, Ohio, with whom I had been associated both personally and professionally, who possessed in an eminent degree not only ability but character, which entitled and gave him the confidence and respect of officials who had to do with the case. He authorized me to employ him. We proceeded with the case.

Morse was pardoned. I, as leading counsel in the case, directed step by step the policies pursued by and with the advice of my associate. If anything irregular was done, I am solely responsible. If anything irregular is charged to me by anyone at any time, I will take care of that situation. I dislike to take part in political bickerings and wranglings. I like a calm, placid life, but I have sat mute and listened to the vile and baseless insinuations uttered against this great and good man, whom I personally know would not under any temptation so far forget either his manhood or his honor as to do an unethical, much less corrupt, professional act. I feel that even without his consent I must break the silence.

Very truly yours,

THOS. B. FELDER,
165 Broadway, New York City.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, the Senator has a very poor opinion of the writer of the letter, I assume—

Mr. CARAWAY. I have.

Mr. MOSES. Because of his reputation as a common liar and because he has been active in trying to prevent the enactment of child-labor legislation, if I correctly understood the Senator.

Mr. CARAWAY. I said that was to his discredit.

Mr. MOSES. That is to the discredit of any person.

Mr. CARAWAY. Well, I think any lobbyist has a very poor job. A man who goes around lobbying may be an entirely respectable citizen in some sections, but I do not take to him kindly myself.

Mr. MOSES. I will call the Senator's attention to the fact that if the opposition to child-labor legislation is reprehensible, he may gain some very valuable information if he will turn to a roll call in the Senate on the 18th of December, 1918, which is recorded on page 629 of the Record. On that roll call 12 votes are recorded in the negative, which may be worthy of his study.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; and they will be worthy of the Senator's study.

Mr. MOSES. I was here at the time.

Mr. CARAWAY. I know the Senator was. I voted for the child-labor law myself, but other Members on both sides of the House of Representatives, where I then served, were opposed to it because they thought it was unconstitutional, and unfortunately the Supreme Court agreed with them. They had taken an oath to support the Constitution, and some people feel bound by oaths—others do not.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I may call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the measure to which I have reference was not the child-labor law for which the Senator from Arkansas voted and which the court held unconstitutional.

Mr. CARAWAY. I know nothing about it, then.

Mr. MOSES. I refer to the amendment to impose a special tax upon the products of child labor.

Mr. CARAWAY. That act has not as yet been passed upon by the Supreme Court.

Mr. MOSES. The vote was 50 to 12 in favor of it, and all of the 12 negative votes happened to come from the side of the aisle which the Senator is ornamenting. It may be interesting to him to know that.

Mr. CARAWAY. It might be interesting to know that those on this side of the aisle have been the ones who thought the Constitution ought to be upheld.

Mr. MOSES. Including the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments?

Mr. CARAWAY. I want to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. Does he think Felder is a man who ought to be believed?

Mr. MOSES. I do not know him at all; I have taken the Senator's word for it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Do not do that.

Mr. MOSES. I recognize, of course, that the Senator is an authority on such matters, and I take the Senator's word about a constituent from his neighborhood.

Mr. CARAWAY. Well, he used to be in my neighborhood, but his reputation grew so unsavory that he moved up the Senator's way, where the company would be more congenial.

Mr. MOSES. He has not as yet happened to come within the circle of my acquaintance.

Mr. CARAWAY. You will meet him; do not be impatient. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I started to say—and I hope I shall be able to do so—that I do not care to discuss personal differences. In the controversy that has now grown up concerning the Attorney General it was not my intention to repeat anything except what I understood was of common reputation and undisputed fact. The charge against the Attorney General was not made by me. It had been published over and over again, and, as I have been able to show from the newspapers, the Attorney General admits the charge. He had taken the credit for his performance, whatever it amounted to, long years ago. The mere mention of it, however, met with a storm of protest, as if it were a new charge which I had dragged to light. Since it has been repeated and denied I find that it is true, and have so shown.

Permit me again to express the hope that the Attorney General—and I rather believe he will, for the Senator from Ohio, for whom I have great respect, tells me that Mr. Daugherty is a man without fear and of personal integrity, and therefore I know he does not want to leave his friend the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] embarrassed—will make a full statement admitting he had misled the Senator from Indiana, so that the Senator from Indiana, for whom I have the very greatest respect and liking, will not be subjected to criticism for having repeated the statement the Attorney General had made to him.

THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7456) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, recurring to the item of boric acid in the bill, I believe that some reason should be given for the action of the majority of the Senate committee. I observe that the chairman of the committee is not present at this time; but, inasmuch as he and the Senator from Utah were conferring just before the Senator from North Dakota left the Chamber, I presume that the Senator from Utah will be able to give us the information, and if he has any information on the subject I think it should be given.

I therefore ask the Senator from Utah to tell us why the Finance Committee took the action which it did take regarding this item, boric acid.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that the Senator from Utah and the Senator from North Dakota were discussing another subject matter.

The Senator complains because of the fact that in the report of the committee this item was not mentioned, and therefore, he says, the Senate knows nothing about it. I wonder if there ever was a report made by any committee on a tariff bill where there were thousands of amendments that mentioned every item and gave the reason why all the changes were made. The report is long enough as it is; but if the committee had made a report of that kind we would have not one volume but a good many volumes to present in a report. This, however, is an item that can be discussed in a very few words and the reasons given why the Finance Committee of the Senate reduced the rate provided for in the House bill.

Briefly, I will say to the Senator, the reasons are these:

In my opinion we can make boric acid in this country as cheaply as it can be made anywhere in the world. Ninety per

cent of all the boric acid that is shipped into the United States comes from Italy, and they can make it about as cheaply—not quite as cheaply, I think—as we can make it in the United States, although at times the cost is about equal, and I think with the depreciated currency to-day they may have a little advantage over the producer in the United States. In normal times they would not have any advantage, and America could hold her own if the product were on the free list. The Payne-Aldrich Act placed a rate of duty of 3 cents a pound on boric acid; the Underwood Act placed a rate of duty of three-fourths of a cent a pound on it. In the latter case it was purely a revenue measure, without a question of doubt. The rate that the Senate has put in here will be purely a revenue measure if this bill is on the statute books a year or two.

I will say to the Senator from New Mexico now that I do not believe the industry would be destroyed at all if boric acid went on the free list, but if we can raise some money in this way by Italy shipping boric acid into this country at certain points where it does not have to be reshipped and where the freight rate enters into the question I think we ought to have this little revenue from it. Frankly, I will say to the Senator that that is what this is, and nothing more nor less.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I think the Senate is entitled to this information; but nothing was tendered by any member of the committee before the matter was submitted for a vote, and I can not understand why this duty should have been imposed upon this commodity under all the information which was presented to the Senate Finance Committee.

I do not know yet how the Senator from Utah or the other members of the committee reached the conclusion that this was a mere revenue duty. There is no testimony on the subject, either as to the cost of production in this country or as to the cost of production in Italy.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the reason is that no producer of the article cared whether the duty was 3 cents or 2 cents, and I do not think they cared whether it was $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents. Nobody was here asking for a reduction or for an increase. Nobody appeared here upon it, and we did not expect anybody to appear.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I think I shall show before I conclude that somebody did appear.

Mr. SMOOT. Before the Finance Committee?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Not before the Finance Committee, but before the Committee on Ways and Means in the House, all of which hearings have been referred to by the members of the Finance Committee from time to time when they have been seeking some light upon the subject.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator want the Senate to reject the amendment and have the House provision adopted?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. No, Mr. President; I do not want that. What I do want is to leave the duty upon this item just where the law puts it to-day, because I do not think it can be shown that any just reason has been given for increasing this duty 100 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose the Senator refers to the brief of the Italian Chamber of Commerce before the House committee.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes; I am going to refer to that. I desire now to present some information regarding this subject myself.

This product, boric acid, is a commodity that is used in many ways in the United States. The production of it is quite large, and its use is rather common, and I think I shall read what the Tariff Commission has to say about it.

The first reference to it in the report of the Tariff Commission is that—

Boric acid, or boric acid, as it is usually called, is made in the United States from a mineral which occurs abundantly in California. Before the war imports were less than 5 per cent of the American production. Within the last four years a substantial export business has developed.

Further on in the Tariff Commission report the statement is made that—

Crude borate minerals are mined in the United States, Chile, Turkey, Italy, Peru, Argentina, Bolivia, and Germany. Before the outbreak of the European war the United States produced about one-half of the total world's supply, Chile about one-third, and Turkey about one-tenth. This output of the United States grew rapidly during the war.

Then the report gives the tonnage of this crude borate, beginning with the year 1903 and going down to 1918, showing that the quantity produced increased from 34,430 tons in 1903 to 88,794 tons in 1918.

This industry is controlled by four concerns:

The Pacific Borax Co., of New York City.
Charles Pfizer & Co., of New York City.
The Stauffer Chemical Co., of San Francisco.
The Thorkildsen-Mather Co., of Chicago.

The information from the Tariff Commission further is that—

Imports of boric acid have been less than 5 per cent of the domestic production. In 1914 Italy furnished 80 per cent of the imports, 18.5 per cent came from England, and the balance from Germany. Imports of refined borax have been entirely negligible, less than 0.01 per cent of the domestic production.

The imports of boric acid for consumption in the United States from 1909 to 1919 are also given, with the unit value of these imports for consumption. The amount of boric acid imported into the United States in 1909 was 230,968 pounds and in the calendar year 1919 it was 276,795 pounds. The unit value of this product imported in 1909 was only 3 cents a pound, and ranged from 3 to 4 cents for several years, and finally, during the war, it reached 11 cents a pound, and in 1919 it was reduced to 8 cents a pound.

There are no statistics on exports available. It is, however, known that before the beginning of the European war exports were small and chiefly to the Orient, but that during the war a substantial export business to Europe was developed. The scarcity of ocean shipping has forced the European nations to supply their needs with refined products from the United States rather than with crude borate material from Chile and Turkey.

Although no statistics of production in foreign countries are available, the import and export statistics show that England and France have large manufacturing industries based on imported raw materials. The German statistics do not show the amount of crude materials imported, but do show that imports of borax and boric acid exceed the export of these commodities. Italy exports boric acid made from Italian raw materials, but imports borax.

Mr. President, the price of boric acid in the United States prior to the war was from 7 to 8 cents per pound. The price in Italy, according to the valuation put upon the exports to the United States, was, as I have just stated, around 4 cents per pound, showing that the cost of transportation and the profits which the importers made, and so on, only justified the importation into the United States prior to the war of not exceeding 5 per cent of the American consumption of boric acid, and the American price was kept up to 7 and 8 cents per pound. During the war the price in the United States reached 14 cents per pound. At the present time the price of boric acid ranges from 11½ to 12½ cents per pound, whereas before the war it was from 7 to 8 cents. In other words, the price of that acid now is about 50 per cent or more above the pre-war price. The amount imported was very small, never at any time in excess of 5 per cent of the domestic production.

The only testimony upon this subject was in a brief or communication presented to the Ways and Means Committee from some people in New York City. That letter is most interesting and it makes an appeal for the retention of the present rate of duty on boric acid. It is really a very impressive appeal from one of our allies in the war. It is called "The brief of the Italian Chamber of Commerce in New York," and it reads:

The Italian Chamber of Commerce in New York is an association of American citizens and business men, incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, representing not only the commercial and industrial class of a community of nearly 4,000,000 of their kinsmen in the United States, of which over half a million are in the city of New York alone, but also the general interests of American firms having trade relations with Italy. This chamber is, therefore, interested in the promotion of commerce and mutual friendly relations between the United States and Italy, as well as in the production and trade of domestic articles and generally in the welfare and prosperity of both countries. It desires to submit to the consideration of your committee in respect to the various sections and schedules of the customs tariff its views and desiderata in connection with their revision, and earnestly hopes that they will receive the attention of your committee. This as Americans we expect, relying upon that spirit of cooperation between the duties of citizenship and the responsibility of legislators that should mark their mutual endeavors to protect and promote the best interests of this country, without forgetting our obligations to those whose pressing needs for help and liberal treatment, enabling them to retrieve, in part at least, their fortunes sacrificed for a just and common cause, we should not be unmindful of on the morrow of battles fought together for the triumph of right and the mutual good. A solidarity of record this, which can not be entirely overlooked, even in such unsentimental work as the framing or revising of a tariff.

The chamber is not unaware of the great difficulties confronting legislators in a tariff revision, particularly now, under such a critical period as that of readjustment from war to peace conditions and after a conflagration of unprecedented magnitude, that has caused the greatest upheaval and strain ever recorded in the economic conditions of practically all nations of the world, and recovery from which can not be, at best, but slow and laborious when the lawmakers intrusted with the serious risk of hastening this recovery are met by an array of most perplexing problems and often left in a quandary of most arduous deliberation. Circumstances like these which, while counseling both conservatism and prudence in their resolutions, seem at the same time to call more than ever for the sympathy and earnest cooperation of the public in the discharge of their responsible duties.

From the outset this chamber desires to record its conviction, which it confidently believes is shared by your honorable committee, that tariff revision should aim strictly at such purposes as come legitimately within the scope of the tariff, namely, first that of raising revenue by such sober and wise regulation of rates as will secure, with a minimum cost to the Government and the least inconvenience to trade, a satisfactory yield, taking above all good care that the source of revenue be not impaired, since an excessive increase of duty would void this purpose,

and next that of offsetting the difference in the cost of production of an article between this and foreign countries. Furthermore, we believe that rather than considering an eventual revision of the tariff to make it serve the purpose of tiding the unavoidable deflation in the prices of commodities, due to the operation of the law of supply and demand in the process of economic readjustment from war to peace conditions, possibility should be afforded between this and foreign nations for entering into such reciprocal agreements regarding their respective commercial relations as would meet with their desires and interests and tend to promote and increase trade between the United States and foreign countries, and thus form an economic cooperation which experience has shown to be of mutual advantage.

Then comes the head "Boric acid, crude and refined borax," and I continue reading from the brief:

Even under normal conditions the importation of boric acid of 276 short tons in fiscal year 1914 was a mere trifle against the domestic output of boric products in this country, amounting in that year to 4,292 short tons of boric acid and 26,501 tons of borax. This is still more true since the war, which has practically eliminated importations, with only 97 short tons to their credit in fiscal year 1918, and 140 and 127 short tons, respectively, in fiscal years 1919 and 1920. Domestic producers are absolute masters of the market, and, notwithstanding their location on the Pacific coast, will easily remain such in future, as transportation through the Panama Canal enables them to land East their output at no higher freights than the imported, while the lower cost of fuel and materials gives them the advantage in an industry where labor has been replaced by machinery to a far greater extent in this country than abroad. There being absolutely no possibility of competition to American industry from the imported product in this line of commodity, this chamber respectfully recommends that the present rates of three-fourths of 1 cent per pound on boric acid and of one-eighth of 1 cent per pound on refined borax and the exemption of duty for crude borax continue unchanged.

Mr. President, I have read that statement in full for the purpose of showing the attitude in which those people come before the Congress regarding this item of commerce. That is a body representing the business interests in the United States of 4,000,000 people of Italian extraction. They present to us the situation in which the unfortunate countries are following this Great War. They make this appeal, and, so far as I am advised, it is the only article in this entire bill about which a request has been made from that representative association. Evidently it means something to Italy. According to the statement, it can not harm the United States. It will not harm an industry in the United States. The importations have never exceeded 5 per cent. The importations in 1920 were only a few tons.

One hundred and twenty-seven tons is all that has been imported of this boric acid.

The production in this country is over 5,000 tons. It can not affect this industry in the United States, but these people came and presented the situation which affects their country. They are trying to recover from the woeful effects of the recent world-wide conflict, and I want to know whether there is anything in the general situation which would warrant anyone in increasing the duty upon a product where an express appeal is made not to have it increased, and where no satisfactory reason is given for the increase.

The revenue which will be derived from the duty to be levied on this item will be infinitesimal because of the very small quantity which can be imported. The great deposits of the crude material are in the United States, and the process of refining is simple and inexpensive. The commodity is produced by only four corporations in this country. There is no evidence of competition between them. All indications are otherwise. To increase the present duty 100 per cent, as the committee proposes to do, will obstruct the small importations which have been coming in and enable the American producers to maintain present prices, which are 50 per cent above pre-war prices, or more probably enable them to raise still higher the price of the enormous quantity sold to the consumers.

I have here the statement regarding our trade with Italy, and I desire to just call attention to it, and I think it will appear that this country is not in danger of being flooded with commodities from Italy. Our imports from Italy in 1918 amounted to \$24,340,000. In 1919 they were \$59,060,000. In 1920 they were \$75,356,000. In 1921 they were \$62,000,000. Certainly that was not a great flood of importations from Italy into the United States, but Italy has been one of our best customers. In 1918 we exported to Italy \$492,174,000. In 1919 we exported \$442,676,000. In 1920 we exported \$371,762,000. In 1921 we exported \$215,462,000.

That shows, Mr. President, that while we have been importing from Italy a very small amount, our exports to Italy have been in large amounts. It is true they are diminishing, and the reason they are diminishing must be evident. They are no longer able to buy the commodities from the United States, and that is one of the reasons why this association from New York appealed to the American Congress to permit this duty to

remain as it is, because they wanted to exchange some of their commodities for the commodities of the United States.

To my mind that appeal is a most pitiful one. Unquestionably this item means something to the people of Italy, else that great association, representing business interests in this country and in Italy, representing the welfare of 4,000,000 people of Italian extraction living in the United States, would not feel that it is of such importance that they would come before Congress and ask that the duty remain as it is. Instead of granting that appeal, that prayer, if you please, while the House increased the duty about 175 per cent, the Finance Committee of the Senate feels that it is doing the righteous thing by increasing the duty only 100 per cent. That is the answer which the Senate Finance Committee sends to New York to these people who are pleading for an exchange of commerce between this country and the rest of the world, where the production in the United States will not be injured. There is no claim here that it will be injured. This increase of duty is the only response to that touching appeal which comes to us, echoing the cry from Italy, from those people who turned the tide on the Piave during the World War, who sacrificed their blood and their resources that, jointly with us, there should be brought about the successful conclusion of the war. That is the appeal which they make, and the only answer is that we will increase the duty 100 per cent.

Mr. President, I think it advisable that there be put into the Record the other industries which will be affected by slowing up or diminishing importations from Italy. The impression has gone abroad, and it is doubtless quite prevalent in the United States, that the only industries interested in foreign trade are the farming industries of the country. I want that impression to be gotten out of the minds of the people of the country. It is true that our exports of food products are quite large, but the exports of material for manufacture in foreign countries and the exports of manufactured products each are substantially as large as the exports of food products. There is a great variety of manufactured products sent to Italy. I want to call attention to just a few.

We start in with a lot of agricultural implements; brass; breadstuffs. Then come machinery, airplanes, automobiles; cars, freight cars and passenger cars; bicycles, tricycles, and motor cycles; a lot of acids; dyestuffs; coal and coke; copper of different kinds; cotton; earthen, stone, and china ware; electrical machinery; fertilizers; iron and steel products, pig iron, ferromanganese; bar iron; bars and rods of steel; wire rods, billets, ingots of steel; bolts, nuts, rivets, washers; car wheels; chains; cutlery; razors; enameled ware; locks and hinges; hardware, hooks; machinery of different kinds; adding and calculating machines; air-compressing machinery; cash registers and parts of; elevators and elevator machinery; engines and parts of, combustible and otherwise.

Then come other iron and steel products, excavating machinery, lawn mowers, metal-working machinery, machined tools, mining machinery, printing presses, pumps and pumping machinery, sewing machines, shoe machinery, textile machinery, typesetting machines, typewriting machines, woodworking machinery, and various other classes of machinery commodities; leather goods; meat and dairy products; and various other classes of commodities of which a surplus is produced in this country.

Mr. President, as an appendix to my remarks I desire to insert a statement showing the various classes of exports which we send to Italy. It is the latest statement I could obtain regarding those exports. The data have been compiled by the Tariff Commission and show the various items of our exports to Italy during the year 1921 covering this great class of commodities. I desire to have that inserted at the close of my remarks upon this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in the different items which the Senator mentioned I did not hear him name those which make up the bulk of the amount, because they are nearly all agricultural products, such as wheat and cotton.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have had appended to my remarks the entire list, including both the quantity and the value.

Mr. SMOOT. But the value is generally largely based on agricultural products which they purchase from us.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. While of course the agricultural products are large, yet I am not so certain about the Senator's statement. Of course they get a great deal of meat products from this country.

Mr. SMOOT. The wheat alone is \$91,054,928, and wheat flour is \$32,726,716.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The list will appear as a part of my remarks. The Senator, however, should not minimize the importance of this trade with Italy, because our principal exports to Italy are products of the farm. But I was calling attention to the fact that the manufacturing interests of the country are as much concerned substantially about the export trade of the country as are the food producers of the country. If the Senator wants to get some information regarding this international trade as a whole as related to the different commodities, I will repeat what I stated in the Senate a few days ago from the list which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In 1920 the exports of foodstuffs amounted to \$1,861,000,000; the exports of manufacturing materials for that same year were \$1,852,000,000, and the exports of manufactured products ready for use for that year were \$1,807,000,000. There were the three great divisions of the export trade just about equaling each other.

In 1921 the exports of the food products amounted to \$1,263,000,000, the exports of manufacturing materials \$991,000,000, and the exports of manufactured products \$899,000,000. They are just about on a parity so far as the export trade is concerned. That was figured out, as the Senator doubtless remembers, by the statistician for the City National Bank of New York, Mr. Austin.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator say that exports to Italy were that much, or all of our exports?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. All of our exports, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. I was speaking only of those to Italy.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I gave the amount of our exports to Italy, I think, while the Senator was for the moment out of the Chamber. But it should be remembered that exports to Italy—I will call the attention of the Senator to that again—in 1918 were over \$492,000,000, while our imports from Italy were only \$24,000,000, or only about 5 per cent as much imported as was exported.

Mr. SMOOT. That was on account of shipping facilities.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. In 1919 our exports to Italy were \$442,000,000 and our imports from Italy \$59,000,000. In 1920 our exports to Italy were \$371,000,000 and our imports only \$75,000,000. In 1921 our exports to Italy were reduced to \$215,000,000 and our imports were reduced a little also. We only imported \$62,000,000 from Italy in 1921.

So, Mr. President, we should encourage this international exchange of commodities, especially where it will not interfere with home production. On the one item which is under consideration it is admitted by everybody that there is no danger of interfering with home production. We have a touching appeal here from the representatives of Italians, naturalized Americans, who yet retain affection for their mother country, and in response to their appeal to allow the tariff on this item to remain where it has been, the Senate committee answers with an increase of 100 per cent, and that in the face of these large exports to Italy and our relatively small imports from Italy. That is the situation and I do not believe the people of this country will tolerate it.

I have here the monthly letter of the Alexander Hamilton Institute, of New York City, giving a review of general business conditions, and I find this statement regarding trade indicators. It refers to the monthly exports of iron and steel. I think the statement gives the March figures, because it is dated April, 1922. I have not the exact date for which the figures are given, but I assume they are for the month of March.

The monthly exports of steel and iron in the corresponding month a year ago amounted to \$137,803,000; in the corresponding month six months ago they had been reduced to \$27,647,000. In the preceding month, the month preceding that in which the letter was written, the exports of iron and steel were \$29,502,000, and in the month covered by the report had been reduced to \$15,149,000. The exports of steel and iron have been reduced from \$137,000,000 a year ago to \$15,000,000 at this time.

The merchandise exports monthly show this situation: That in the corresponding month a year ago they amounted to \$486,000,000; six months ago they amounted to \$367,000,000; one month ago to \$279,000,000, and, according to the last monthly report, they were \$250,000,000; while our imports remained substantially the same for each of those months.

For the corresponding month a year ago the exports of merchandise, I repeat, amounted to \$486,000,000; six months ago they amounted to \$195,000,000; for the preceding month they amounted to \$216,000,000; and, according to the latest report, they amounted to \$217,000,000.

That shows, Mr. President, the very definite trend of our commerce; it shows that our exports are rapidly diminishing, while our imports are remaining comparatively the same. There

can be but one reason why our exports are diminishing in such degree and why our imports are practically remaining stationary. The reason may be attributed to the fact that after the World War our Government was loaning money abroad—though not a year ago, it is true. Then commercial interests took up the question of extending credits, and did extend credits by the billions of dollars. I have seen the estimate made that private credits extended to the rest of the world by interests and people in the United States amount to about \$5,000,000,000. Last year there were floated in this country about three-quarters of a billion dollars of funded securities from foreign countries. Those foreign securities are being put upon the market of the United States every week. Just a few days ago \$100,000,000 of Canadian bonds were floated in the American market. In every commercial report is found a statement of bonds issued by nearly every country in South America and by every country in Europe which is entitled to credit.

They have all come to the United States to get credit, and as they secured credit they bought our goods; but notwithstanding the huge offerings of foreign credits here and their absorption by the American people our exports have been gradually diminishing, until this year our exports of merchandise have decreased about 50 per cent—from \$486,000,000 in the month a year ago to \$251,000,000 in the month last reported. That is what is happening. It is affecting not only the food producers of this country, but it is affecting the manufacturers of the country as well.

When Senators talk about increasing wages and also the products of the manufactories, it can only be as to a certain few which are not affected by the export trade; but if we stop our exports we are going to bring unemployment to the people who labor in the exporting manufactories of the country. That is what is going to happen. The existing condition can not last much longer. Some attention must be paid to the export trade.

I am perfectly willing that full consideration may be given to the support of our domestic industries so far as it may be done, but the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] and all other Senators must know that the levying of a tariff, whether big or little, does not tend to encourage exports. I agree with the association of Italians in New York that we ought to look at this matter in a spirit of reciprocity; that we ought to aid the restoration of the world, so far as it may be done, if it will not materially injure ourselves. We must build up the foreign market if this country is to be prosperous; but we can not restore prosperity here and at the same time build up a wall around the United States and decline to permit the importation of certain commodities.

Mr. President, I have been very much interested in a recent questionnaire of the National Chamber of Commerce. The National Chamber of Commerce, I presume, is composed of more different business interests in this country than were ever brought together at any other time into one association. Quite frequently that association sends out questionnaires for the purpose of obtaining the opinion of the business men of the United States regarding public questions.

A couple of months ago in the issue of the paper from which I shall now read, the March, 1922, issue of the paper called *The Nation's Business*, which sets forth what that chamber of commerce did, there were six propositions submitted. I only desire to refer to two of them. One was:

Reasonable protection for American industries subject to destructive competition from abroad and of benefit to any considerable section of the country.

The next was:

The principle of maintenance and encouragement of our export trade should be observed in tariff legislation so far as consistent with protection of American industries of benefit to any considerable section of the country and subject to destructive competition from abroad.

That is the first time that that measure of a tariff has been announced, so far as I know. We have heard various other standards put forth for the fixing of tariff rates. The difference between the cost of production at home and abroad has been the one most dwelt upon. It has been the one which has been advanced here during the discussion of the pending bill. That difference in cost has been ascertained by the majority of the Finance Committee, according to my notion, in a very uncertain and precarious fashion; the committee has no definite information on which to proceed; but here is another element added by the members of the National Chamber of Commerce; and that is that a duty should be levied for the purpose of protecting the industries which are threatened with destruction from abroad. That is the standard which the chamber of commerce now presents; and I should like to call attention to the vote upon that. The vote on it was 1,852½ for, and against it but 24½.

Remember that that is the standard for the fixing of the tariff according to the vote of the National Chamber of Com-

merce. An industry must not only be subject to destructive competition from abroad, but the industry must be a benefit to a considerable section of the country. That is something new in tariff legislation, so far as I know. The National Chamber of Commerce insists that two things shall occur: That the industry shall be a benefit to a considerable section of the country, and that protection shall be used for the purpose of preventing destruction. Why have they added those two new elements? They have done so because they have realized, as I have tried to point out, the absolute necessity of doing something to foster our export trade; to enable the countries of the remainder of the world to purchase the things of which we produce a great surplus. That is what they say in the other question. Mark the standard laid down by the National Chamber of Commerce:

The principle of maintenance and encouragement of our export trade should be observed in tariff legislation so far as consistent—

With what?

with protection of American industries of benefit to any considerable section of the country and subject to destructive competition from abroad.

The vote upon that question was 1,804½ for it and only 57½ against it.

The Chamber of Commerce, composed of business interests throughout the country, had vision enough to see this situation. So far as this bill is concerned there does not appear anywhere anything which is calculated even to sustain, much less promote, our foreign commerce.

We have the farmers of the country appealing for a market for their wheat, for their corn, for their meat; we have some of the mining interests of the country appealing for a market for copper, and the manufacturers appealing for a market for machinery and for various other commodities which enter into our export trade. The export trade is diminishing almost every day, and nothing under the sun can help it or even sustain it unless we shall bring about an exchange of commodities. This thing of extending credits indefinitely to the rest of the world can not continue.

Mr. President, as I have said, there is nothing in this bill which tends to promote this trade. There is nothing said in the report anywhere on that subject, but the chairman of the Finance Committee undertook to indicate what he expected would result from the passage of this bill. I want to read just a few words from what he said in his opening speech presenting this bill.

After contending that we should sustain the manufacturing interests of the country, and that we could do it only by a drastic protective tariff, he referred to this surplus of farm products. He did not refer to the surplus of manufactured products, but here is what he had to say:

Our soil to-day produces more than the American public consumes. The depressed prices of agricultural products are due to our surplus, augmented, of course, by the Old World bankruptcy.

What does that indicate should be done?

What the farmer needs is the greatest number of consumers of his product. If he can make the home consumption greater than the home production, even though the deficit does not exceed 1 per cent, then, with a proper tariff wall, he can secure a just price for his product.

For the most part, wheat is a drug on the American market. As stated by President Harding in his address to the Congress, a bumper crop of wheat in the United States often brings in less cash to the farmer than a very much smaller crop. We want more acres of farm land planted to other products. We want to encourage the farmers in this country to sow millions of acres to flax, to hemp, to onions, to beans, and other such products. * * * We want to reduce the wheat surplus.

Mr. President, those are the consoling recommendations which come to us from the chairman of the Finance Committee in presenting this bill. What he would do with regard to the surplus of wheat would be simply to compel the farmers of this country to quit producing wheat, and he tells them in a very complacent manner to quit producing wheat until the amount is so reduced that there will not be quite enough for the consumers of this country, to quit producing wheat and go to growing flax. That is what he would do, and that is his only message of condolence to the people of this country—that they must quit growing wheat and go to growing flax. That is his message to the meat raisers of this country—quit raising meat and go to raising flax. That is his message to the copper producers of this country—quit producing copper; go to raising flax. That is his message to all these thousands of employees in the great industries of this country of every kind which produce a surplus—to quit producing their surplus and go to raising flax. That is what he says to the cotton producers of this country: "Do not produce a surplus. Let us build around this great United States a tariff wall. Let us produce only enough of these commodities to satisfy home consumption. Let us isolate ourselves from the rest

of the world. Let our cotton producers stop raising cotton and go to raising flax."

That is the consolation which is brought to us here by the chairman of the Finance Committee. That is what this bill means. Take up that speech, rendered here deliberately, prepared in advance, doubtless every word studied, read in the Chamber, and that is the consolation which this country receives: "If you can not produce copper, raise flax. If you can not find a market for your surplus of anything else, raise flax." My humble judgment is that if this bill becomes a law, instead of these people raising flax they are going to raise—fire and brimstone for the supporters of this bill.

APPENDIX.
Exports to Italy.

	Quantity.		Value.	
	1920	1921	1920	1921
Abrasives:				
Wheels, emery and other.....			\$142,391	\$94,860
All other.....			73,110	22,001
Agricultural implements:				
Hay rakes and tedders.....			27,704	16,088
Mowers and reapers.....			236,805	85,456
Plows and cultivators.....			363,394	20,349
All other.....			213,433	60,952
Parts of.....			148,593	92,363
Aluminum:				
Ingot metal and alloys, pounds.....	660,018	470	187,210	93
All other manufactures of.....			5,178	26,802
Art works: Painting and statuary.....			179,297	32,030
Asbestos:				
Ore and unmanufactured tons.....	96		71,738	
Manufactures of.....			48,620	17,432
Brass:				
Bars, plates, sheets, etc. pounds.....	105,106	35,989	29,175	10,491
All other manufactures of.....			57,775	29,706
Breadstuffs:				
Bread and biscuit..... pounds.....	84,652	8,224	30,841	2,583
Corn..... bushels.....		248,497		191,421
Corn meal and corn flour barrels.....	1	2,235	5	10,910
Cereal preparations.....			25,877	13,767
Rice..... pounds.....	135,474	1,120,668	17,954	39,595
Rye..... bushels.....	2,415,084	1,131,693	4,612,682	2,040,097
Wheat..... do.....	32,110,050	60,842,457	85,356,226	96,118,352
Wheat flour..... barrels.....	1,410,243	56,122	15,115,828	382,363
All other breadstuffs.....			1,102	5,345
Cars, automobiles, and other vehicles:				
Automobiles and parts of—Commercial—chassis number.....	36	2	67,230	809
Passenger—Complete cars number.....	288	25	386,923	38,646
Chassis number.....	316	4	295,340	4,675
Parts of, not including engines and tires.....			372,288	143,161
Cars for railways—For steam railways, freight and other, number.....	2,526		4,601,020	
Parts of, except car wheels and axles.....			822,517	1,991
Bicycles, tricycle, etc.....			174,501	16,699
Motorcycles..... number.....	2,281	571	652,430	173,316
All other vehicles and parts of.....			159,917	28,730
Celluloid, and manufactures of.....			535,688	23,688
Chemicals, drugs, dyes, and medicines:				
Acids.....			378,965	1,444
Alcohol, wood..... gallons.....	72,305		35,107	
Coal-tar distillates, n. e. s.—Benzol..... pounds.....	4,961,878	348,880	357,956	22,030
All other.....			290,499	
Dyes and dyestuffs—Aniline dyes.....			582,235	45,068
Logwood extract.....			404,367	8,723
All other.....			275,149	70
Formaldehyde (formalin).....			116,242	26,057
Glycerin..... pounds.....		116,918		17,270
Infants' food.....			35,763	164
Lime, acetates of..... pounds.....	2,645,138		73,916	
Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations.....			34,063	44,824
Petroleum jelly, etc.....			65,892	18,346
Potash.....			198,163	
Roots, herbs, and barks.....			93,595	33,816
Soda—Caustic..... pounds.....	21,107,104	7,626,851	971,810	307,162
Soda ash..... do.....	21,313,978		566,143	
All other salts of.....			323,114	10,457
All other chemicals.....			33,394	67,842
Chewing gum.....			33,394	595

Exports to Italy—Continued.

	Quantity.		Value.	
	1920	1921	1920	1921
Coal and coke:				
Coal—Anthracite..... tons.....	4,882	155	\$60,073	\$1,900
Bituminous..... do.....	2,357,734	1,549,490	21,070,535	11,728,479
Coke..... do.....	750	500	14,400	4,000
Cocoa and chocolate, prepared or manufactured (not including confectionery).....			150,797	2,062
Coffee, green..... pounds.....	2,013	136,999	560	26,805
Copper:				
Refined copper in ingots, bars, or other forms..... pounds.....	918,802	16,369,962	201,450	2,219,847
Composition metal..... do.....	38,546		17,271	
Pipes and tubes..... do.....	173,510		85,023	
Plates and sheets..... do.....	150,432	44,775	51,574	11,123
Wire, except insulated..... do.....	1,201,570	114,472	298,387	24,487
All other and manufactures of.....			32,139	140,193
Cotton:				
Unmanufactured—Upland and other pounds.....	282,170,131	278,766,767	103,024,497	47,768,283
Linters..... pounds.....	681,177	59,289	62,798	3,557
Manufactures of—Cloths—Unbleached..... yards.....	112,747	129,600	23,415	14,175
Bleached..... do.....	147,754	19,498	37,017	2,246
Mill waste..... pounds.....	2,990,914		684,060	
Rags (except paper stock)..... pounds.....	193,662		37,051	
Thread, sewing, crochet, etc.....			20,677	
Wearing apparel—Corsets.....			17,803	
Knit goods (hosiery)..... dozen pairs.....	243,112	28,650	754,765	28,650
All other manufactures of.....			168,829	44,819
Dental goods.....			15,942	1,935
Electrical machinery and appliances (except locomotive):				
Carbons.....			62,644	138
Dynamos or generators.....			244,539	133,772
Insulated wire and cables.....			124,109	107,670
Interior wiring supplies (including fixtures).....			33,795	2,898
Lamps, incandescent, metal filament..... number.....	329,611	12,199	80,545	4,772
Magnetos, spark plugs, etc.....			143,838	2,108
Meters and measuring instruments.....			101,554	16,239
Motors.....			406,366	83,885
Rheostats and controllers.....			25,609	20,325
Switches and accessories.....			62,588	68,180
Telephones.....			131,791	15,682
Transformers.....			29,579	346,836
All other.....			1,381,576	921,904
Explosives:				
Cartridges, loaded.....			13,889	2,431
All other.....			178,885	146
Fertilizers.....			2,396	77,670
Fibers, vegetable, manufactures of:				
Bags.....			59,668	61,902
Twine, binder..... pounds.....			99,773	
All other manufactures of.....			38,534	753
Fish:				
Dried, smoked, or cured—Cod, haddock, hake, pollock..... pounds.....	2,778,428	346,714	396,631	27,432
All other..... do.....	216,820	90,970	30,133	12,566
Salmon, canned..... do.....	164,956	24,275	31,107	2,467
Canned fish, except salmon and shellfish.....			73,166	16,190
All other fish and fish products.....			9,931	74,344
Fruits:				
Apricots, dried..... pounds.....	6,500	59,996	2,530	14,323
Prunes, dried..... do.....	353,275	372,896	80,063	40,795
All other fruits.....			14,575	7,061
Furs, and fur skins, and manufactures of.....			37,210	7,198
Glass and glassware:				
Bottles, demijohns, carboys, and jars.....			20,693	1,078
All other.....			22,044	54,635
Glucose (corn sirup)..... pounds.....	9,013,212	1,428,105	643,630	47,262
Glue, animal..... do.....	60,423	635	15,167	213
Gold and silver manufactures, including jewelry.....			15,721	15,838
Grease:				
Lubricating.....			167,869	96,021
Soap stock and other.....			473,320	252,972
Hats, and materials for.....			19,564	142
Hides and skins (except fur skins) raw:				
Cattle..... pounds.....	115,700	3,600	58,850	560
All other..... do.....	1,633	590	25,103	150
Household and personal effects.....			279,387	263,260
India rubber, manufactures of:				
Shoes..... pairs.....	110,846	6,738	104,871	4,557
Druggists' rubber sundries.....			26,498	1,922

Exports to Italy—Continued.

	Quantity.		Value.	
	1920	1921	1920	1921
India rubber, manufactures of—Continued.				
Tires—				
For automobiles—				
Casings... 2			\$972,509	\$24,700
Inner tubes			86,595	410
All other			14,735	245
All other manufactures of			91,707	40,161
Ink, printers' and other			14,728	95
Instruments for scientific purposes			29,960	15,039
Iron and steel:				
Pig iron... tons	36,128	300	1,622,081	7,200
Scrap and old, for remanufacture	1,726		68,400	
Bars, or rods of steel—				
Wire rods... pounds	8,712,544		365,257	
All other... do.	4,838,357	2,347,355	194,014	85,851
Billets, ingots, and blooms of steel... tons	21,100	645	1,293,271	72,273
Bolts, nuts, rivets, and washers... pounds	810,457	3,323	35,758	450
Car wheels and axles			365,111	
Castings, n. e. s.			24,770	1,101
Chains			31,690	7,443
Cutlery—				
Razors, safety			191,962	69,496
Table			31,408	491
All other			14,028	906
Firearms			15,642	5,349
Forgings, n. e. s.			20,936	4,971
Hardware—				
Builders'—				
Locks			70,279	6,317
Hinges and other			89,478	13,017
Other hardware			28,489	7,760
Hoop, band, and scroll, pounds	691,856	64,716	24,053	1,928
Machinery, n. e. s.—				
Adding and calculating machines... number	1,859	573	342,238	133,407
Air-compressing machinery			160,211	91,007
Cash registers and parts of—				
Cash registers, number	185	163	42,409	41,655
Parts of			2,542	3,014
Concrete mixers			14,126	54,321
Engines and parts of—				
Internal-combustion engines—				
Gasoline—				
Marine, number	212	179	45,452	20,034
Stationary... number	33	40	15,299	7,456
Traction... number	53		81,782	
Kerosene, traction, number	57	1	47,500	400
Steam engines, locomotives... number	175		4,184,947	
All other engines			16,340	3,085
Parts of—				
Boiler tubes			105,174	171,196
All other parts of engines			240,817	53,950
Excavating machinery			35,932	25
Metal-working machinery—				
Lathes			152,034	2,972
Other machine tools			641,488	65,181
Sharpening and grinding machines			106,218	11,575
All other metal working			589,078	159,572
Mining machinery—				
Oil-well machinery			10,068	624
All other mining			10,152	23,182
Printing presses			165,576	355,677
Pumps and pumping machinery			49,646	56,433
Road-making machinery			28,581	1,290
Sewing machines			110,231	10,593
Shoe machinery			98,642	31,198
Textile machinery			336,014	120,615
Typesetting machines			102,699	47,050
Typewriting machines			1,352,254	545,507
Woodworking machinery			20,575	5,147
All other machinery and parts of			1,301,397	354,003
Nails and wood screws			91,049	19,195
Pipes and fittings—				
Cast... pounds	156,638	40,592	15,417	7,689
Wrought... do.	7,588,037	1,866,034	484,149	124,625
Rails of steel... tons		1,297		84,872
Switches, frogs, splice bars, etc.			1,970	16,780
Safes... number	37	8	13,204	1,435
Sheets and plates—				
Galvanized... pounds	321,896		23,431	
Iron... do.	59,404	426,692	1,409	29,125
Steel—				
Plates... do.	82,383,257	53,916,053	3,131,882	1,548,452
Sheets... do.	3,422,961	1,826,026	251,648	157,859
Ship and tank plate, punched and shaped... pounds	199,809	1,000,400	6,025	34,000

Exports to Italy—Continued.

	Quantity.		Value.	
	1920	1921	1920	1921
Iron and steel—Continued.				
Stoves and ranges			\$50,695	\$17,670
Structural iron and steel				
... tons	6,758	14,019	453,120	674,951
Tin plates,terne plates, and taggers' tin... pounds	13,994,902	14,022,645	1,214,115	1,003,131
Tools, n. e. s.—				
Augers, bits, and drills			76,552	12,974
Files and rasps			242,675	58,196
Saws			42,529	6,025
All other			221,953	61,357
Wire... pounds	471,255	40,106	32,095	3,629
All other manufactures of iron and steel			408,938	122,093
Leather and manufactures of—				
Carriage, automobile, upholstery			302,503	12,385
Glove			29,870	528
Patent... square feet	3,149,509	827,316	2,234,415	276,283
Sole... pounds	19,497	799	14,555	604
Upper—				
Calf and kip... square feet	964,994	211,812	700,345	103,171
Goat and kid... do.	1,692,793	343,787	1,406,551	159,685
Cattle sides—				
Grain and finished splits... square feet	1,265,741	155,972	748,883	51,928
Wax, and rough splits			33,964	11,065
All other upper			854,233	40,937
All other leather			139,712	62,218
Manufactures of—				
Boots and shoes—				
Children's... pairs	8,698	203	22,372	331
Men's... do.	184,490	12,009	1,107,690	71,259
Women's... do.	34,463	3,240	240,318	16,551
Leather belting, pounds	25,696	1,429	49,498	2,346
All other manufactures of			318,888	20,553
Leather, imitation			550,496	33,058
Malt... bushels	358,238	412,990	604,635	488,463
Meat and dairy products:				
Meat products—				
Beef products—				
Beef, fresh... pounds	211,447		40,682	
Beef, pickled and other cured				
... pounds	430,437		86,497	4,606
Oleo oil... do.	386,181		81,428	60,047
Tallow... do.	378,363		52,724	19,204
Hog products—				
Bacon... do.	18,844,911		3,840,134	1,071,051
Hams and shoulders, cured... pounds	3,235,225		801,498	3,304
Lard... do.	23,153,676		5,334,923	1,512,208
Pork, canned... do.	25,343		5,372	
Pork, pickled... do.	27,072		5,225	2,624
Lard, compounds, etc.				
... pounds	187,540		41,826	4,798
Sausage				
Canned... do.	49,533		26,445	155
All other... do.	156,490		74,353	1,497
Sausage casings... do.	1,007,828		131,829	160,490
Stearin from animal fats				
... pounds	1,675,568		441,025	74,670
All other meat products			51,659	28,088
Dairy products—				
Butter... pounds	220,650		152,252	303
Cheese... do.	341,499		121,273	15,178
Milk—				
Condensed (sweetened)... pounds	4,124,096		502,733	10,897
Evaporated (not sweetened)				
... pounds	6,547		617	19,434
Powdered (dried)				
... pounds	138,858		53,913	40,853
Metals, metal compositions, n. e. s.:—				
Babbitt metal... pounds	18,038		6,385	5,101
All other and manufactures of			89,397	14,615
Musical instruments:				
Pianos... number	36		20,254	27,205
All other			5,614	2,242
Naval stores:				
Rosin... barrels	32,797		595,064	90,608
Tar, turpentine, and pitch				
... barrels	4,104		53,865	43,018
Turpentine, spirits of, gallons			12,895	13,591
Nickel, manufactures of			294,996	2,111
Oilcloth and linoleum			38,191	42,556
Oils:				
Animal... gallons	31,898		59,359	5,040
Mineral—				
Crude... do.	593,237		77,121	
Refined or manufactured—				
Fuel and gas oil, gallons	55,490,567		3,996,899	1,845,485
Diminuting... do.	29,352,088		3,475,682	2,041,580
Lubricating... do.	22,934,182		8,661,720	5,966,237
Naphtas and light products of distillation—				
Gasoline, gallons	12,879,426		3,079,584	1,595,247
All other... do.	20,557,778		5,192,003	2,045,411
Residium... do.	1,767,462		102,187	

Exports to Italy—Continued.

	Quantity.		Value.	
	1920	1921	1920	1921
Oils—Continued.				
Vegetable, fixed or ex-pressed—				
Cocoa butter.....pounds..	91,266		\$36,371	
Coconut.....do.....	1,679,607		403,962	87
Corn.....do.....	2,147,250		455,143	41,644
Cottonseed.....do.....	22,976,091		5,436,312	2,834,777
Soya bean.....do.....	26,330,121		5,740,451	102,902
All other.....do.....			229,236	8
Paints, colors, and varnishes:				
Dry colors—				
Carbon, bone, and lamp-black.....do.....			22,301	8,365
All other.....do.....			9,628	3,357
Ready mixed paints, gallons.....	4,623		12,407	25,795
Varnish.....do.....	123,755		232,672	68,030
Zinc, oxide of.....pounds.....	2,108,351		187,100	11,263
All other.....do.....			47,175	23,375
Paper:				
Books, maps, music, etc.....			54,923	47,562
Carbon paper.....do.....			29,344	8,014
Playing cards.....do.....			680	21,480
Printing paper, newsprint.....pounds.....	1,961,835		122,533	
Tissue and toilet paper.....do.....			20,624	
All other.....do.....			46,313	26,340
Paraffin:				
Unrefined.....pounds.....	10,049,433		692,831	92,379
Refined.....do.....	38,769,947		3,728,700	2,099,444
Pens, fountain.....number.....	71,970		104,563	28,883
Phonographs, etc.:				
Phonographs, graphophones, etc.....number.....	76		10,973	12,379
Records and accessories.....do.....			20,276	1,763
Photographic goods:				
Cameras.....do.....			60,070	224
Motion-picture films—				
Not exposed.....linear feet.....	517,312		13,293	6,746
Exposed.....do.....	1,263,625		78,443	18,918
Other sensitized goods.....do.....			79,978	1,823
Other apparatus.....do.....			41,996	6,618
All other.....do.....			7,154	4,030
Plumbago or graphite:				
Unmanufactured.....pounds.....	72,038		14,827	183
Manufactures of.....do.....			46,757	271,155
Seeds, grass:				
Clover.....pounds.....	412,499		129,675	
All other grass seed.....do.....	70,560		25,782	297
Shells.....do.....			27,698	1,638
Shoe findings.....pounds.....			19,472	
Silk, manufactures of:				
Wearing apparel.....do.....			179,518	7,449
All other.....do.....			4,911	3,267
Silk, artificial, hosiery, dozen pairs.....do.....	17,509		166,065	24,043
Soap:				
Toilet or fancy.....pounds.....	2,756,790		47,262	9,480
All other.....do.....			330,788	4,887
Spirits, distilled: Alcohol (including pure, neutral, or cologne spirits).....proof gallons.....	7,467,358		2,496,723	159,025
Starch:				
Cornstarch (except for table use).....pounds.....	1,146,440		61,251	33,126
All other.....do.....			462,553	30,848
Stearin, vegetable.....do.....	138,526		25,279	1,100
Sugar and molasses:				
Molasses.....gallons.....	333,724		87,687	181,734
Sirup, including maple sirup.....gallons.....	79,984		28,873	60,272
Sugar, refined, including maple sugar.....pounds.....	1,939,947		193,501	2,914,943
Surgical appliances (not including instruments).....do.....			18,973	
Suspenders and garters.....do.....			21,207	8,362
Tobacco:				
Unmanufactured—				
Leaf.....pounds.....	44,160,278		13,097,714	11,267,083
Stems and trimmings.....pounds.....	27,550		4,100	
Manufactures of—				
Cigarettes.....thousands.....	2,095,418		5,541,333	26,240
Cigars and cheroots.....do.....	50,051		1,059,923	42,533
Smoking.....pounds.....	711,337		233,200	29
All other.....do.....			250,145	65
Typewriter ribbons.....do.....			36,228	19,732
Vegetables:				
Vegetables, canned.....do.....			13,705	1,206
All other.....do.....			30,567	2,061
Vulcanized fiber and manufactures of.....do.....			69,357	21,108
Wood:				
Timber, sawed, pitch pine (long leaf).....M feet.....	5,380		246,985	262,161
All other unmanufactured.....do.....			11,522	9,292
Lumber—				
Boards, planks, and scantlings—				
Fir.....M feet.....	3,517		486,441	16,500
Gum.....do.....	2,127		243,218	115,710
Pine, yellow, pitch.....M feet.....	2,019		110,619	256,190
Spruce.....do.....	5,296		711,480	
All other boards, planks.....do.....			34,472	11,551
All other lumber.....do.....			21,906	31,426

Exports to Italy—Continued.

	Quantity.		Value.	
	1920	1921	1920	1921
Wood—Continued.				
Lumber—Continued.				
Furniture (not metal).....do.....			\$21,565	\$12,611
Hogsheads and barrels, empty.....do.....			16,181	5,000
Staves.....number.....	465,488		77,889	39,227
Wood pulp.....tons.....	249		26,949	
All other manufactures of.....do.....			93,673	49,813
Wool:				
Unmanufactured.....pounds.....	114,806		51,200	
Manufactures of—				
Woolen rags.....do.....	248,633		41,424	1,200
All other manufactures of.....do.....			10,498	3,972
Zinc:				
Cast in pigs, slabs, etc.—				
Produced from domestic ore.....pounds.....	1,119,496		114,050	530
Produced from foreign ore.....do.....	123,258		9,930	
Zinc, rolled in sheets, strips, etc.....pounds.....	1,597,503		186,571	5,308
Other manufactures of zinc.....do.....			9,801	1,162
Total domestic exports.....			368,010,978	211,706,591
Total foreign exports.....			3,751,296	3,756,310
Grand total exports.....			371,762,274	215,462,901

Mr. SMOOT. May we have a vote on the amendment?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gooding	McLean	Sheppard
Ball	Hale	McNary	Shortridge
Borah	Harrell	Moses	Simmons
Brandegge	Harris	Myers	Smoot
Broussard	Harrison	Nelson	Spencer
Bursum	Heflin	Newberry	Stanley
Calder	Hitchcock	Nicholson	Sterling
Capper	Johnson	Norbeck	Sutherland
Caraway	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Swanson
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Oddie	Townsend
Curtis	Kellogg	Overman	Trammell
Dial	Kendrick	Owen	Underwood
Dillingham	King	Page	Wadsworth
Edge	La Follette	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	Lenroot	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Ernst	Lodge	Polindexter	Warren
Fletcher	McCormick	Pomerene	Watson, Ga.
France	McCumber	Rawson	Weller
Glass	McKellar	Robinson	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment on page 2, line 9, by striking out "1½" and inserting "¾"; and upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, line 9, in the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out the numerals "1½" and to insert "¾."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. How will the amendment then read?

The READING CLERK. So that it will read:

Boric acid, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARAWAY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McKINLEY]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD] and vote "nay."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). In the absence of my pair, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON of Georgia (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr.

CAMERON]. Being unable to obtain a transfer, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. McKELLAR (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. I find I can not obtain a transfer of my pair, and I shall therefore be compelled to withhold my vote, which I do. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. DIAL. I desire to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is detained by illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. HALE. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW] and vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (after having voted in the affirmative). The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], with whom I have a pair, is absent from the Chamber. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. EDGE. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Ashurst	Heflin	Overman	Stanley
Caraway	Hitchcock	Owen	Swanson
Dial	King	Pittman	Underwood
Fletcher	La Follette	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Glass	McKellar	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Harris	Myers	Sheppard	
Harrison	Norris	Simmons	

NAYS—47.

Ball	Ernst	McCumber	Rawson
Borah	France	McLean	Shortridge
Brandegee	Gooding	McNary	Smoot
Broussard	Hale	Moses	Spencer
Bursum	Harrell	Nelson	Sterling
Calder	Johnson	Newberry	Sutherland
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Nicholson	Townsend
Cummins	Kellogg	Norbeck	Wadsworth
Curtis	Kendrick	Oddie	Warren
Dillingham	Lenroot	Page	Weller
Edge	Lodge	Phipps	Willis
Elkins	McCormick	Polindexter	

NOT VOTING—23.

Cameron	Frelinghuysen	New	Stanfield
Colt	Gerry	Pepper	Trammell
Crow	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Watson, Ga.
Culbertson	Keyes	Reed	Watson, Ind.
du Pont	Ladd	Shields	Williams
Fernald	McKinley	Smith	

So the amendment of Mr. JONES of New Mexico to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, line 10, strike out "12" and insert "18," so as to read:

Citric acid, 18 cents per pound.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 230, line 6, after the words "provided for," strike out the proviso in the following words:

Provided, That for a period of five years beginning on the day following the passage of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid, on the actual potash (potassium oxide) content of all the foregoing, a duty of 2½ cents per pound for the first two years; 2 cents per pound for the third year; 1½ cents per pound for the fourth year; and 1 cent per pound for the fifth year: Provided further, That thereafter the said potash content shall be free of duty.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, nearly all the potash brought into this country is used in the manufacture of fertilizers, and the duty placed on potash will be paid by the farmers. Those engaged in agriculture have suffered more than any others during the business depression, and it is almost impossible for the farmers to make any profit on their products. It would be a great injustice to tax them on the fertilizers they must buy to raise their crops, and I hope the Senate will pass the amendment I have offered placing potash on the free list.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Georgia will be printed and lie on the table. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I move as an amendment to the committee amendment to strike out the numerals "12," in line 10, page 2, after the words "citric acid," and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "5."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from California whether he desires to address the Senate upon this amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to submit some very brief observations respecting it.

Mr. KING. I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. KING. I supposed the Senator from California desired to address the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON. What is the desire of the Senator from Utah? He has presented an amendment to the amendment. Does he desire to be heard concerning it?

Mr. KING. I shall speak at some length concerning it, but it would be very gratifying to me if I might have the pleasure of hearing the Senator from California first.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would rather deny the Senator that particular pleasure and listen to him.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I regret that I have not been advised by the Senator from California, who I assume is the spokesman for the Senate amendment which increases the House rate upon citric acid, what reasons exist for this remarkable advance. In my opinion, the increase from 12 cents per pound to 18 cents per pound is wholly unwarranted and indefensible. I shall ask the Senate to not only not concur in this Senate amendment but support a motion to reduce the rate to 5 cents per pound, which is the rate in the Underwood-Simmons law.

The Finance Committee have asked for 18 cents per pound tariff upon citric acid, the House bill carries 12 cents per pound, the Payne-Aldrich tariff law fixed 7 cents per pound, and, as stated, the Underwood-Simmons law fixes the rate at 5 cents per pound.

Before proceeding to a discussion of citric acid, I desire to read an editorial appearing in to-day's New York Journal of Commerce, a Republican paper of influence and power. I wish all Senators would read the editorials appearing in this ably edited journal upon tariff and cognate questions, because I am sure they would derive benefit and obtain enlightenment, and thus be enabled to vote—shall I say more intelligently, certainly more logically—upon the schedules now before us.

Under the heading "Tariff joker No. 3" the following is stated in the editorial:

In the House form of the pending tariff bill the duty on glue and gelatine was fixed at 20 per cent ad valorem.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK], who is the chairman of the Senate Republican committee, just passed me and made some comment sotto voce about "glue." Unfortunately for his party the Indiana Republicans were not glued sufficiently to the reactionary policies of the Republican Party and therefore voted for Mr. Beveridge.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ODDIE. I think it might be interesting to the Senator from Utah to make a little calculation of the combined votes of the two Republican candidates and the combined votes of the several Democratic candidates in the election held in Indiana yesterday.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am delighted that my friend the Senator from Nevada has projected himself, perhaps indirectly, into a discussion of political conditions in Indiana. His great familiarity with the situation there undoubtedly enables him to speak authoritatively as to the reasons for the small vote in the Democratic primary. If he were familiar with the situation there the Senator would know that there was a bitter contest between our distinguished and greatly esteemed colleague [Mr. New] and former Senator Beveridge. Our colleague, as everyone knows, is a warm friend of the President of the United States and undoubtedly represented in that contest the administration; in a sense the administration was on trial and he was the representative of the views and policies of the President and the administration, policies which I have heretofore denominated as reactionary, and which are being defended by the "die-hards" and the "hard-boiled" elements of the party in power with such accretions as it may receive.

Mr. Beveridge is a former Progressive. He followed the flag of Mr. Roosevelt when President Harding and Senator New followed the flag of Republican orthodoxy. Presumably Mr.

Beveridge stands for policies adverse, in some respects, at least, to the reactionism of the Republican Party.

The Senator from Nevada must know that when swords are drawn between such antagonists as Senator New, a brave, gallant, and chivalrous man, fighting as he did for the reactionaries of his party and for the Republican administration, and Mr. Beveridge, representing the more liberal elements of the Republican Party, and having, of course, his personal following, and the remnants of the Progressives, there would be a battle royal that would bring to the polls the combined strength of the Republican Party as well as the personal following of the two leaders.

Mr. ODDIE. The Senator has undoubtedly noted the statement by Mr. Beveridge in his campaign that he would be a strong supporter of the present administration.

Mr. KING. I remember what the Senator states, and though Mr. Beveridge, according to the press, made statements of a general character about supporting the administration, he proceeded to denounce some of the policies and tendencies of the Republican Party, including the way some Republicans in this Chamber, including the Senator from Nevada as well as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW], voted upon certain questions. The Senator knows what votes I have particularly in mind.

Among the Democrats there was no contest. Former Governor Ralston, whom everybody knew to be a genial, able, chivalrous gentleman, was a candidate in the Democratic primaries for the Senatorship. His nomination was conceded by all. There were two gentlemen who announced their candidacy, but no campaign of any importance was waged and the Democrats, realizing the situation, paid but little attention to the primary. There was nothing in the political contest upon the Democratic side that occasioned organization activity or the bringing to the polls of any number of votes. But let me say to my friend from Nevada to be a little patient and wait until next November; he will then see the invincible Democracy of Indiana with its army of voters who will commission Governor Ralston to occupy a seat after the 4th of March next on this side of the Chamber. The Republican administration will be repudiated there as it is being repudiated throughout the United States.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will Governor Ralston or the Senator from Utah in the interim between now—

Mr. KING. The Senator is going to ask about the League of Nations?

Mr. McCORMICK. Precisely.

Mr. KING. I knew it.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will Governor Ralston and the Senator declare before November whether or no they wish the United States to subscribe to the covenant of the League of Nations and enter into the integral enforcement of the treaty of Versailles?

Mr. KING. Is that the end of the Senator's question?

Mr. McCORMICK. That is the question the Senator from Illinois has asked.

Mr. KING. I am not in the confidence of Governor Ralston. I am not his political keeper. I can not say what he advocated during the primary campaign or what he will declare for between now and November. One thing I think I can say to the Senator, though, and that is, Governor Ralston will not declare for the four-power treaty which has been provocative of an alliance between Germany and Russia which not only threatens the peace of Europe, but may constitute a menace to the world.

Mr. McCORMICK. Perhaps the Senator will tell us how many of his colleagues who are candidates for reelection are prepared to urge that the United States shall subscribe to the covenant of the League of Nations and the integral enforcement of the treaty of Versailles?

Mr. KING. My colleagues upon this side of the Chamber do not have to advise me of their views as to the League of Nations, and I do not need to ask them. We have perfect freedom upon this side of the Chamber. I have no doubt those who are candidates for reelection upon the other side of the Chamber advise the Senator from Illinois and get his consent as to what to say and how to act in the coming campaign. So I do not know what the Senators on this side of the Chamber who are candidates for reelection will say or do respecting that question, but I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I know they will do this: Those who are candidates for reelection, as sensible, rational, patriotic men, will point to those questions which are the supreme issues of the hour—

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. Let me finish, and then I shall be glad to yield.

The supreme issues of the hour, or at least the paramount issues of the hour, relate to internal and domestic problems;

and one of such questions, if not the principal one, is the infamous McCumber-Fordney tariff bill which is now before us—

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. One moment. Of course, I disassociate my friend from North Dakota from the evils and monstrosities of the bill.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from North Dakota is a little heterodox on the League of Nations. I want to finish this debate uninterrupted by him.

Mr. KING. I should be glad to debate with both Senators, but one at a time.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator states that the really dominant issue now is the tariff bill—not the League of Nations, not what has happened in Indiana, but this particular tariff bill. We have now reached the item of citric acid—

Mr. KING. A very sour subject.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator point out what he thinks is a proper duty upon citric acid?

Mr. KING. I have already stated—

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the real dominant question now.

Mr. KING. I have already stated 5 cents a pound and have moved to amend the bill which is before us.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator tell us why he thinks the rate should be 5 cents a pound?

Mr. KING. I shall be very happy to do so; but I can not answer both Senators at once.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am asking the Senator to hold to what he considers to be the dominant issue—the pending tariff bill.

Mr. KING. I do not wonder that my good friend from North Dakota wants to lead us away from a discussion which to him and, doubtless, to the reactionaries upon the other side is not very palatable. I stated that one of the dominant issues of the hour was the tariff bill and that it and various domestic questions, in my judgment, would be regarded as the controlling and, indeed, paramount questions before the American people in the coming campaign. If I may be permitted to resume at the point I had reached when interrupted by the Senator from North Dakota, I was stating to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] that my colleagues who are seeking reelection, as rational, sensible, and patriotic men—

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. Let me complete my sentence.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator's colleagues are thinking men, but not speaking men. There are beside him candidates for reelection. Will they join their voices to the still small voice of the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and say that they would have the United States enter the League of Nations and enforce the treaty of Versailles? Come forward, gentlemen! Speak out, gentlemen! Are you for the League of Nations as you were before? Would you not enforce the treaty of Versailles? I do not ask the Senator from Utah. He has announced that he is going to return to the practice of law, but you who are to seek the suffrage of the people in your State next November, are you for or against the League of Nations? Would you or would you not enforce the treaty of Versailles?

Mr. KING. The Senator from Illinois, among his many other virtues, does not have the still small voice. [Laughter.] I will come back to the question which I was stating when twice interrupted by the Senator from Illinois.

I was stating that my colleagues, and they are competent to speak for themselves and will speak before the election in such a manner as may not be satisfactory to the Senator from Illinois, as rational men would address themselves to the supreme issues before the American people.

It has been said by writers who are familiar with our political contests that only one great political question is settled in any one election. I do not affirm the correctness of that position. Indeed, it will bear study and consideration. In my opinion the controlling and paramount questions that will be before the American people in the coming election will relate largely to domestic problems. There are enough of those questions to entitle the Democrats to a victory. The record of our Republican friends in dealing with domestic problems, to say nothing of foreign problems, has been so malodorous and so imperfect that undoubtedly there will be reactions against their party in other States, as there was yesterday in the great State of Indiana.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois as an adroit, clever, and capable political leader, schooled in the politics of the State of Illinois and elsewhere, has learned, under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt and under the leadership of reactionaries whom he is now following, all angles of the issues involved and the best methods of securing results. As an adroit political leader he knows that the American people are turning against the Republican Party upon domestic questions, and he is trying to divert their attention from the mistakes of his own

party, from its palpable blunders, from its wretched administration of the affairs of the Government, and to do so seeks to project into the political arena a question which is not now the paramount or the controlling question before the American people. I congratulate him upon his skill, upon his perspicacity, but I can assure him the Democrats will not follow him as their political leader. We prefer to follow the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and other great leaders in the Democratic Party who by their experience and devotion to Democratic principles are competent to direct the policies of the Democratic Party.

Mr. MOSES. And, Mr. President, may I add, who helped to frame the four-power pact which the Senator from Utah has just denounced?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Illinois has just returned from a remarkable convention in Illinois in which he was the pilot. He joined forces with Thompson, of Chicago, for the first time in a long time. He wrote the platform. Did he indorse the four-power pact in that convention?

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from Mississippi can read the platform. It is very definite. It speaks clearly upon the foreign policy of this administration, upon the League of Nations, and the treaty of Versailles.

Mr. HARRISON. Did it say anything about the four-power pact?

Mr. McCORMICK. It did not.

Now, let me continue, if I may. The junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has charged me with raising the issue of the League of Nations.

Mr. KING. No; I said the Senator was trying to do it.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator means to be exact; he always means to be just. It was the former candidate of the Democratic Party, the ex-governor of Ohio, who first proclaimed that the League of Nations was still a political issue in this country; who proposed that the Democratic National Committee should again meet to indorse the proposal that the United States enter the League of Nations. There is no one on this side of the Chamber who raised the issue. There were some of us who thought, as does the Senator from Utah, that one great question may be settled in an election, and we had hoped the question of the League of Nations had been settled. The present President of the United States, speaking for his party, has said that we would have none of the league.

The candidate of the Democracy in the last election has announced, not once but three times, that events were drawing the United States into the League of Nations; that he believed that we must subscribe to the covenant thereof; and that the Democratic National Committee should meet to proclaim that proposition. I ask the leader of the Democratic Party yonder, and the Senators who are to be candidates in the forthcoming campaign, to say "aye" or "no," whether they agree or disagree with ex-Governor Cox upon the question of the League of Nations?

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. McCORMICK. Is that an unreasonable request? Is it unreasonable to ask that some one other than the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], secure from any division between the parties, or some one other than the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], who is voluntarily to retire from the Chamber, should answer that question?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah pardon me? It is only imperative necessity which prompts the inquiry I am about to make.

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Committee on Patents is meeting at present for the consideration of one very important question that is pending before it. There is an impasse between two departments of the Government as to—

Mr. KING. I shall not ask for a vote while the Senator from California is absent from the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON. I desire to be present when the Senator from Utah speaks in reference to the duty upon citric acid.

Mr. KING. When citric acid is reached, if the Senator from California is not then present, I shall refrain from discussing that subject and take up another item in the tariff bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thank the Senator. I wanted the Senator from Utah to pardon me for being absent during his speech.

Mr. KING. I want the Senator to be present when I speak.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am most anxious to hear the Senator in other regards as well; and I am more sorry than I can tell that I shall miss his rejoinder to the Senator from Illinois [Mr.

McCORMICK]; but it is an important matter on which the Committee on Patents are engaged.

Mr. KING. I know the importance of the work which is pending before that committee, and I hope the committee will report a bill that will not permit patentees, when they obtain a monopoly from the Government, to hide their patents and deny their benefits to the people.

Mr. JOHNSON. We are wrestling in the committee with the subject.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, after getting through with Indiana for a moment, and the ex-Governor of Nevada, I come back to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. However, there is one remark I want to make before proceeding to answer him, and that is that one thing the election in Indiana did was to take "New" out of "Newberry." It accomplished that result. The Newberry question was an issue in that campaign and will be an issue in other States in the coming election. In making that observation, let it be understood that I am speaking with due courtesy of the able junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY] and without any desire whatever to offend him or to impugn his motives or his character—

Mr. ODDIE rose.

Mr. KING. Let me complete the sentence—but the American people believe that the expenditure of more than \$200,000 in the last senatorial primary campaign in the State of Michigan was not consistent with American traditions or consonant with fair and honest elections. They feel that there was nothing that could warrant such a stupendous expenditure.

They believe that in the expenditure of such an enormous fund there must have been, directly or indirectly, corruption somewhere, somehow, and they will visit their displeasure upon the party which indorsed that expenditure, as the Republican Party indorsed it in their vote seating the junior Senator from Michigan, and as they indorsed it in adopting the amendment which was offered by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] to the resolution seating him.

I now yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ODDIE. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if he does not believe that Henry Ford is anxious that the discussion on the Newberry matter shall continue, for the reason that it sells thousands of automobiles for him?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am not interested in what some persons irreverently call "Tin Lizzies," as the Senator from Nevada evidently is. I am not selling Henry Ford's cars. I am not in the confidence of Henry Ford, as evidently the Senator from Nevada is. The Senator from Nevada seems to think that this discussion—and he is to blame for it—will aid Henry Ford in selling cars; the Senator being responsible for the discussion, and it being of benefit to Mr. Ford, it is clear that the Senator from Nevada is the agent of Henry Ford, and is aiding him in the sale of his products.

Mr. President, I want to be frank with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. He has asked me—he did so several days ago, and repeated the question to-day—what my views are upon the League of Nations. It is wholly immaterial what my views on that subject are.

I am not of enough importance in the Democratic Party or elsewhere that my views would be controlling, but I frankly say to the Senator from Illinois, speaking for myself and myself alone, that, sooner or later, the United States of America, with proud and triumphant step, and with a desire to serve this Nation and the world, will enter a league of nations, an association of the nations of the world. This it will do—as a progressive, Christian nation—in order that the peace and prosperity of all peoples may be secured. Humanity is marching toward the goal of international amity; peace on earth, good will toward all men, world fellowship—world association—these are not baseless dreams or mere phantasms. The unity of the race and a common civilization are objectives toward which the moral and spiritual leaders of the world will direct humanity's faltering steps. It may be an ideal, but it is one that will never perish; it will persist until it conquers; thus the ideal will culminate in the attainable and in the attained.

The Senator from Illinois stated that the President of the United States, Mr. Harding, had repeatedly declared against the League of Nations. I hope I correctly state what the Senator said. I do not know whether the President of the United States has said that or not.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator will recall the address delivered in this Chamber by the President.

Mr. KING. I remember the cryptic utterances of the President of the United States; I remember that he said repeatedly before and during the campaign, in substance, that he was

for an association of nations. I know that in the Senate of the United States Warren G. Harding, when a Senator, voted for the League of Nations with reservations, the chief of which related to article 10 of the league. I am advised, may I say in passing, that the members of the league place the same interpretation upon that article as was given it by Senator Wolcott, of Delaware, and by a number of distinguished Senators upon this side of the Chamber, as well as by able lawyers of the United States when the treaty was before the Senate, namely, that it imposed no legal or moral obligation upon members of the league to go to the aid of any member nation when its territorial integrity or its political independence was attacked, but that each nation was to determine for itself what its attitude should be in the light of the then existent circumstances.

Mr. McCORMICK rose.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator desire to interrupt me?

Mr. McCORMICK. I was going to say that the President voted for the league with reservations, and doubtless with qualms as well.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am not in the confidence of President Harding. If the Senator says he has "qualms," doubtless he speaks with authority. I do not know, however, what he means by "qualms"—whether he is speaking of the President's mental and intellectual organism and faculties or his physical attributes, his physical qualms. The Senator may be a pathologist; he may be able to distinguish between intellectual qualms and physical qualms. I congratulate the Senator upon his knowledge of pathology and therapeutics, as well as his psychological attainments.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, may I call the attention of the Senator to a strange recurrence?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. I note that whenever the question of the League of Nations is discussed nearly all of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber from north of the Mason and Dixon's line who are candidates for reelection leave the Chamber.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator may take what comfort he pleases from the alleged absence of candidates for reelection upon this side of the Chamber. I repeat that, after reading the speeches of President Harding—his prelection speeches, and the speeches which he has made since—no man can say that President Harding is against a world association of nations.

I say to the Senator from Illinois, while the association or League of Nations may not be, and probably will not be, the great question in the coming election it is a live question in the United States; it is a question that will not down; that can not be buried by the sophistry of the Republicans, by their cunning, by their subtlety. It will be here to-day and to-morrow and next year and in the coming years, until, in God's own providence, there will be international fellowship, brought about and effectuated through a world organization and a world association of nations. I am for the League of Nations with proper reservations—

Mr. McCORMICK. Oh!

Mr. KING. Oh. I voted for the League of Nations with reservations, and I voted for it without reservations; and I say now, Mr. President, that the economic collapse of the world, which reacts to the disadvantage of the United States, is attributable largely to the folly of Republican Senators in not ratifying the Versailles treaty, which would have permitted this Nation, entering the league, there to sit down at the world's council, indeed heading that council and wearing the crown of moral, of political, and material primacy.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, does not the Senator think that if we sat down at the table at Genoa our waistcoat might—

Mr. KING. There would have been no Genoa conference if the United States had gone into the League of Nations.

Mr. McCORMICK. It might not have been necessary. Our pockets might have been frisked before any such conference was held.

Mr. KING. They have been frisked now. Under your policy you have frisked from us since the Republicans have come into power billions of dollars in the depreciation of the value of American products. You have cut off our trade with other nations; you have laid your deadly hands upon other nations and contributed to their demoralization and to their economic ruin, as you have contributed to the economic ruin of the American people. The Republican Party, Mr. President, has been weighed in the balance with respect to its foreign policies, as it is being weighed in the balance now with respect to domestic policies, and it has been found wanting.

Mr. President, I return to the point that I was discussing when the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] challenged my

attention to the delightful results of the election in Indiana day before yesterday. That election is a sore spot for you Republicans, and it will be much sorer to-morrow and the following day. You have your ears to the ground to-day listening—listening to portentous sounds. Your heads were high day before yesterday. You were to have a vindication in the returns in Indiana. Your heads to-day are bowed, your hearts are sore, your cheeks are blanched, and you are waiting now with trepidation and fear for the ides of November. God help you! You need it.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, where are those Democratic Senators who were for our subscribing to the League of Nations?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have said to the Senator once, and I say again, that Democratic Senators do not have to consult with me as Republican Senators who are candidates for reelection have to consult with the Senator from Illinois, who is the purseholder and the money gatherer, and who will control the elections through the instrumentality of the campaign funds in the various States—I say that with all due respect, of course—legitimate campaign funds.

Mr. McCORMICK. I think the Senator does not mean that.

Mr. KING. Yes; I do, in a sense. Let me explain.

Mr. McCORMICK. Oh, I think not.

Mr. KING. The Senator is chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee.

Mr. McCORMICK. He is. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], who is absent from this debate, is chairman of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee.

Mr. KING. And the Senator from Montana undoubtedly will attempt to collect some money from Democrats to use in the campaign, in a legitimate way, as I expect my distinguished friend from Illinois will do; but the Senator from Illinois knows that one of his duties—and I am not complaining, it is a laudable, it is a proper duty—is to try to obtain needed and proper campaign funds for legitimate use in States where Republican candidates are seeking reelection.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator, if I remember his remark, suggested that I would seek to control the course of candidates through the instrumentality of that fund.

Mr. KING. Oh, no.

Mr. McCORMICK. If the Senator said that, I am sure he will want to withdraw the remark.

Mr. KING. The record will show what I said. I did not mean to say that. If my remarks bear that construction, I apologize to my friend, because I would not do him an injustice. What I intended to say, and what I say now, is this:

The Senator from Illinois, because of his ability—and I say that not in flattery, but sincerely—because of his long political experience, because of his knowledge of political affairs in the United States, because of his association with Mr. Roosevelt and the Progressive Party, as well as his association with the reactionary Republican Party, knows political conditions in the United States, and he has been selected because of his superior knowledge as the chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee, and as political leader it is his duty to gather such campaign contributions as he can in an honorable way, as I know he will, and that he will expend the funds so collected in the various States where there are candidates for reelection. I have no doubt that the Republican candidates who are candidates for reelection are consulting the Senator now, as they will continue to consult him in the future.

I return to the reading of the interesting editorial, Mr. President, from the Journal of Commerce, of New York:

In the House form of the pending tariff bill the duty on glue and gelatin was fixed at 20 per cent ad valorem and 1½ cents per pound, while manufactures of glue and gelatin were 25 per cent.

The Senate bill varies the rate from 20 per cent and 7 cents to 20 per cent and 15 cents, while in certain cases the ad valorem rate is as high as 25 per cent.

As to this, careful inquiry shows that these packing-house commodities are simply by-products. They have no "cost of production" as such, but any duty is a clear gift to the makers by enabling them to raise their prices to correspond. Under the old tariff rates our total product of glue, which was \$13,733,000 in 1914, rose to \$32,132,000 in 1919, while our exports advanced from \$259,000 to \$2,405,000 in 1920. Imports meanwhile were only \$590,000 in 1920. There is no danger whatever of foreign competition, the quantity brought from abroad being, as just shown, negligible. The Senate bill is an absolutely unwarranted advance in the rate.

Mr. President, the Senate bill with respect to these items—and the same is true as to carbide, dyes, and hundreds of others, as will be shown before we get through—is written in the interest of trusts and combinations, which already have raised the price levels until they bear oppressively upon the consuming public. A gratuity, a gift, is bestowed upon the packers and other interests that directly or indirectly control the glue

industry of the United States, according to this Republican newspaper.

Aside from raw material the cost of gelatin is said to be determined by the cost of coal, sulphuric acid, muriatic acid, and peroxide of hydrogen, all of which are cheaper here than in Europe. The Payne tariff permitted domestic producers, it is estimated, to add \$3,800,000 to their prices—

And the American people had to pay for it—while the present tariff may allow \$6,400,000 under the House bill and greater amounts under the varying rates of the Senate draft. Here is a handsome, if surreptitious, gift to producers under the guise of protection based on difference in cost of various grades of the article.

There are many Republican newspapers, as well as many Republicans, in the United States who are voicing their opposition to this bill, pointing to its inequitable features and to the evils which will follow the adoption of these schedules.

I promised the Senator from California not to discuss the item of citric acid until his return to the Chamber; accordingly I shall refer to a subject which is pertinent to the question before us.

It has been repeatedly stated that the high rates of duty provided for the various commodities in Schedule 1 of this bill were necessary to protect the manufacturers of chemicals produced in this country, and the inference was that we had no chemical industry until the war, and that as a new industry it must have what it demands. I believe that some persons listening to the statements of Republicans and to some Republican newspapers would reach the conclusion that the chemical industry was the child or the product of the war; that we had no chemical production in the United States, either direct chemical production or chemical productions of an allied nature or character, prior to 1914.

The fact is, Mr. President, that on the 31st day of June, 1914, we had invested directly and indirectly in chemical production \$2,017,000,000 plus, and that the products for that year of chemical industry covered by Schedule 1 of the bill aggregated more than \$3,000,000,000; in other words, that the output exceeded the capital in the ratio of 3 to 2. And yet we are appealed to to support this bill because we must have a chemical industry in the United States, and without these prohibitive rates it is impossible. Many of our chemical industries, as a matter of fact, have been in existence for many years.

Some instructive tables and valuable information are found in a publication of the Department of Commerce in 1919 called "Miscellaneous Series, No. 82." It is there shown that the chemicals which we would denominate chemicals per se, measured by that standard—which are found in this bill—if they were put into juxtaposition with the products of the chemical industry, it would appear that they represent less than 2½ per cent of the total value of the commodities provided for in Schedule 1 of this bill.

Mr. President, this pamphlet which I just referred to, on page 8, has the following:

This publication presents statistics for 5,500 natural and manufactured articles imported into the United States during the fiscal year 1913-14.

Substantially all of those 5,500 articles are embraced within Schedule 1, though most of them are under what are called "basket clauses."

The principal classes of materials considered in this publication are:

Abrasive materials, asbestos, baking powder, blacking, bronze powders, candles, chalk, chemicals (including acids), clays, coal-tar products (except dyes), drugs, dyeing materials, explosives, fertilizers, gelatin and glue, greases and tallow, gums and resins, inks and ink powders, medicinal preparations, oil cake; oils, animal; oils, mineral; oils, vegetable; oils, essential; petrolatum, pigments, paints, perfumes, cosmetics, and toilet preparations, salt, soaps, sulphur, tanning materials, turpentine and rosin, varnishes and waxes.

Some of the articles are found in the next schedule. They are not all included in this schedule.

I wish there were more Senators here to understand the significance of this statement that of the 5,500 products listed in this publication, only 2,500 were imported in amounts exceeding \$100 in value, totaling approximately \$268,000,000. The remaining 4,000 products were imported in amounts less than \$100, totaling in the aggregate \$61,000.

What does that mean, Mr. President? It means that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914—that is, before the war, when Germany was reputed to be the dominant and controlling factor in the chemical world—she shipped to the United States but a fraction of the \$268,000,000 of all these 5,000 items which are found in this schedule. On the following page of this report it is shown that our exports for the same period covered by this schedule amounted to \$265,019,258; so that from all the world, Germany giving but a portion of them, we imported but \$267,000,000 plus, and exported \$265,000,000 plus, and produced more than \$3,000,000,000 of chemical products.

Turning to page 11, we find here the classification of all of the items within the chemical schedule which were imported into the United States for the fiscal year 1913-14, keeping in mind, now, that that was before the war, when Germany was alleged to be supreme. We imported only \$2,000,000 plus of acids, \$28,000,000 plus of chemicals, \$8,000,000 of coal-tar products, except dyes, and, according to the figures of the Norton census, given us also by the Department of Commerce, as I carry them in my head, that amounted to approximately \$10,000,000. They are not in this book.

Drugs, flowers, leaves, nuts, and herbs, \$7,000,000 plus.

Dyeing and tanning material, \$2,000,000 plus.

Extracts for dyeing and tanning, except coal-tar dyes, \$2,000,000 plus.

Fertilizers, \$28,038,000. I shall show later on that those came from Chile, or most of them.

Gums (including india rubber, crude, valued at \$71,219,051), \$88,903,829.

Medicinal preparations, dutiable (including menthol, valued at \$424,917, imported from British India), \$1,289,608.

Oils, animal, \$1,000,000 plus.

Oils, vegetable (expressed), \$43,000,000 plus.

Oils, essential (distilled), \$3,000,000 plus.

Paints, pigments, artists' colors, and varnishes, \$2,000,000.

Perfumes, cosmetics, and toilet preparations, \$2,000,000.

Sodium nitrate, \$7,951,455.

Mr. President, all of these imports—\$197,343,535—consisted of crude materials; that is to say, they came into the United States not in the finished and consumable-by-the-public form, and became the basis of American industry, so that the larger part of our imports under this schedule, while Germany was supposed to dominate the chemical world, consisted of crudes, which were used by manufacturing plants, by industries in the United States, thus giving an impetus to our industrial development and employment to thousands, if not tens of thousands, of American workmen.

Yet our Republican friends, in their midsummer madness—because it will be midsummer before this bill passes—are determined to strike at the very foundations of our industrial prosperity and development. They would cut off the importation of crudes and all finished products. They would in their devotion to trusts and special interests prevent the exportation of American products, and while striking at friendly nations they would at the same time strike at their own country and injure the American consumers. This they would do in order to give a monopoly to the Carbide Trust, the National Chemical Co., the du Pont Co., and other great trusts and combinations, whose names will be mentioned before we conclude the discussion upon this bill. We propose to let the people of the country know, so far as we have the power to do so, that this schedule is drawn for the trusts, in the interest of the trusts, and that the result will be, when this bill becomes a law, the exploitation of the American people.

Only \$43,674,163 of manufactured chemical products—that is, products which I have called chemicals per se and are comprised in the figures shown on page 12 of this report (Miscellaneous Series No. 82)—were imported into the United States at the time when Germany was supposed to be supreme and the United States was, according to our Republican friends, supposed to have no chemical industry.

Mr. President, if Germany in 1913-14, with her tremendous wealth, with her technical skill, with her claimed world supremacy in chemical matters, could not send to the United States any greater value of chemicals than that which the records show, how, I ask, can Germany, prostrate, now compete with American industry, which has access to the inexhaustible resources of this great Nation?

I stated the other day that Germany had lost most of her coal, iron, and potash. Germany is now compelled to go into the markets of the world and buy copper and other raw materials in order to make any showing as a manufacturing nation. We have the raw materials to make the products; and still our Republican friends say we must keep out any competition, as Germany and the European nations are about to destroy American industries.

I turn again to this same Miscellaneous Series No. 82 and find the list of the imports of chemicals for the year 1913-14, where each item was valued at less than \$100. The names appear, totaling, as I recall, 4,500. One would suppose that many of these items would be placed upon the free list in this bill, because the value of the imports when Germany and the nations of Europe constituted strong industrial nations and were producing chemically and in an industrial way were so inconsequential.

The number so placed in the free list, if my computation was correct, is only 14. Fourteen out of 4,500 items the importation of which was less than \$100 have been placed by our Republican friends upon the free list.

But assume, Mr. President, that there are some items in the schedule which ought to be protected which come within the category of infant industries. Why the necessity of penalizing the American people on thousands of items where there is no necessity and where the American production not only is adequate for the domestic consumption but produces an excess and must find markets abroad?

Mr. President, there are hundreds—indeed, thousands—of items in the bill as to which the imports have been and are less than 1 per cent of the domestic production. There are hundreds and hundreds of items as to which there is no importation at all, and yet our Republican friends have been so friendly with the trusts, so considerate of the chemical combines and interests in the United States, that they have placed duties upon those very items, thus enabling the domestic producers to extort such prices from the American consumers as their greed and avarice may dictate.

Protection has been defended upon the ground that an infant industry needed aid, and that imports of like products produced by the domestic industry would enter into such sharp competition as to destroy the American producer. How can these high rates be defended when there is no competition? Is 1 per cent competition? When there are no imports can it be said that there is competition? Of course, that is absurd. It is an abuse of the taxing power of the Government to lay duties upon foreign commodities when there is no importation, or where the importation of such commodities is less than 1 per cent of the domestic product.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask the Senator from Utah to yield to me for a few moments.

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish to detain the Senate just a moment. A day or two ago I made some general observations with reference to the War Finance Corporation and certain bills which have been introduced in the Senate, one by myself, providing for larger banking facilities for agriculturists and live-stock raisers in the country than are afforded through the War Finance Corporation.

In the course of my remarks I caused to be read from the desk an interview with Mr. Harvie Jordan, which appeared in the Raleigh News and Observer. In the interview Mr. Jordan stated that the governor of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Harding, had made a further ruling against loans to enable farmers and stock raisers to hold their products off the market for the purpose of a more orderly marketing of such products.

I am now in receipt of a letter from Governor Harding, dated May 2, which really was called to my attention only this afternoon, in which he refers to the interview of Mr. Jordan and states that he was incorrectly quoted, that he had made no such ruling, that the board of which he is the head had made no such ruling, and that the board did not hold the opinion with respect to the matter stated in the interview with Mr. Jordan, and requesting that some publicity be given to the denial.

He also discusses in the letter to some extent the question of agricultural credits and clearly indicates that both he himself and the Federal Reserve Board are in favor of some system which will adequately provide credits and banking facilities to farmers and to stock raisers. He also makes it clear that he does not think it would be advisable to attempt to accomplish this through amendments to the Federal reserve act.

The letter, I think, is valuable in itself, and Governor Harding is entitled to have it made public. I shall ask the Secretary to read all of the letter except one paragraph, which the governor makes confidential. I would like very much to have that paragraph read, but by reason of his desire that it shall be treated in confidence I ask that the Secretary eliminate it. I desire to have the letter read, because I think Governor Harding is entitled to have it read and I think the Senate is entitled to know what he says upon this very interesting and very important subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD,
Washington, May 2, 1922.

Hon. F. M. SIMMONS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In the course of your remarks which are published on pages 6131 to 6133 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 1, 1922, you referred to and caused to be inserted in the RECORD a statement taken from the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of April 27, 1922, by Mr. Harvie Jordan, national secretary of the American Cotton

Association. As this statement is untrue in so far as it refers to me, I am taking the liberty of addressing this letter to you.

I have reference to the particular part of the statement which reads as follows:

"* * * Gov. W. P. G. Harding, of the Federal Reserve Board, recently interpreted the law of the Federal reserve banking system to the effect that agricultural loans based on farm products as collateral can not be rediscounted for the purpose of holding such products off the market, the inference being that for farmers to borrow money for the purpose of holding cotton or other staple products off the market is speculation."

"This interpretation of the Federal reserve law means that when staple farm products are ready for market they must be promptly sold, whether markets are stagnant or not. It means an encouragement or enforcement of the dumping method of marketing, which has always carried the penalty of low prices to the growers. The policy now being generally adopted by farmers to market their products slowly and in an orderly manner to regulate supplies to meet the needs only of legitimate consumption will meet a deathblow if the law as interpreted by Governor Harding is enforced."

I desire to say in the first place that I have never attempted to interpret the law or make rulings for the Federal Reserve Board. Every interpretation or ruling is made and adopted by the board as a whole.

In the second place, I wish to point out that the Federal Reserve Board has never interpreted the Federal reserve act in the manner suggested in the statement in question. On the contrary, the Federal Reserve Board in its rulings, and on every appropriate occasion, has taken the position that such holding of agricultural products as is incident to orderly marketing is a legitimate and necessary part of the business of agriculture, and that a loan made to a producer or farmer for the purpose of financing such holding is clearly an agricultural loan which is eligible for rediscount by Federal reserve banks within six months of maturity. Furthermore, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks have recognized that in determining to what extent the holding of agricultural products is incident to orderly marketing the condition of the market for such products, or the market demand, must be taken into consideration, and that renewal loans made necessary by reason of inability to dispose of products at a reasonable figure and in an orderly manner during the period of the original loan may also be eligible. In other words, in direct contradiction of the published statement of Mr. Jordan, the Federal reserve act has been interpreted by the board so as to permit the gradual and orderly marketing of agricultural products as and when there is a demand for them, instead of requiring the farmers to market their products by the so-called "dumping method."

I have read your remarks as published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with much interest and I agree entirely with you, as I am sure the other members of the Federal Reserve Board would also, that there is grave need for additional credit facilities available to agriculture, and that it would be inadvisable to attempt to provide such facilities through amendments to the Federal reserve act. Senator HEFLIN, who addressed the Senate after the conclusion of your remarks, inferred that the Federal Reserve Board "will fight" any legislation intended to provide such additional credit facilities. I desire to assure you that such is not the case. You are no doubt familiar with Senate bill 3051, which was recommended by the Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry as a means of affording additional credit facilities for agricultural purposes through the enlargement of the powers of the Federal land banks. The chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency referred this bill to the Federal Reserve Board, and in a letter dated January 26, 1922, the board expressed its approval of the bill in the following terms:

"While the proposed bill deals mainly with the Federal farm-loan system, the administration of which does not, of course, come within the jurisdiction of the Federal Reserve Board, the board is glad of the opportunity to say that the bill has its cordial approval and support. The board believes the bill to be sound and constructive legislation that is well designed to afford much needed relief to agricultural and live-stock interests by adding to their available credit facilities, which at the present time are not adequate for their requirements."

For your information a copy of that letter is inclosed herewith.

The Federal Reserve Board has not had occasion to consider the bill introduced by you, S. 3390, and I am not familiar with its detailed provisions.

In order to correct the erroneous impression that Mr. Jordan's published statement would create, I request you to give the same publicity to this letter that you have given to the article containing that statement.

Yours very truly,

W. P. G. HARDING, Governor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I have also received from Governor Harding, attached to the letter which has just been read, a letter written by him, dated January 26, 1922, and addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Hon. GEORGE B. McLEAN. I think probably it was sent to me with the expectation that it would be presented in connection with the letter which has just been read. For that reason I ask that, without reading, it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD,
Washington, January 26, 1922.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of January 23, 1922, inclosing a copy of Senate bill 3051 and requesting the views of the Federal Reserve Board with regard to it. This is the bill the enactment of which is recommended in the recently published report of the Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry. The same bill has also been introduced in the House of Representatives as H. R. 10058.

While the proposed bill deals mainly with the Federal farm loan system, the administration of which does not, of course, come within the jurisdiction of the Federal Reserve Board, the board is glad of the opportunity to say that the bill has its cordial approval and support. The board believes the bill to be sound and constructive legislation; that is well designed to afford much needed relief to agricultural and live-stock interests by adding to their available credit facilities, which at the present time are not adequate for their requirements.

The bill proposes to add to the Federal farm loan act a new title, title 11, consisting of sections 201 to 209. Subdivision (a) of section 201 provides that each Federal land bank, subject to regulation by the Federal Farm Loan Board, may discount for any bank or live-stock loan company, with the indorsement of such bank or company, any note or other such obligation the proceeds of which have been used for an agricultural purpose or for the raising, breeding, fattening, or marketing of live stock, and may make loans to any cooperative association of producers of staple agricultural products upon the security of warehouse receipts covering such products. Subdivision (b) of section 201 provides for the issuance by Federal land banks of debentures or other such obligations with maturities not in excess of three years secured by discounts or loans made under subdivision (a). Section 204 provides that any Federal reserve bank may discount for a Federal land bank, upon the latter's indorsement, discounts or loans made under section 201 which have a maturity at the time of discount by the Federal reserve bank and in excess of six months, and section 206 provides that any Federal reserve bank may buy and sell the debentures and other obligations of a Federal land bank issued under section 201 to the same extent and subject to the same limitations as those upon which they may buy and sell Federal farm loan bonds. The other sections of the new title provide for the creation of a "farm credits department" in each Federal land bank for the purpose of exercising the powers conferred by the title, and provide that the capital of each such department shall be \$1,000,000, to be subscribed by the United States, and contain certain other necessary administrative provisions which are not important for the purposes of this general discussion.

At the present time the Federal farm loan act provides the means for supplying the farmers long-time credits upon the security of first mortgages upon agricultural lands; and under the terms of the Federal reserve act agricultural paper with a maturity not in excess of six months is eligible for rediscount by Federal reserve banks after it has been discounted and indorsed by a member bank of the Federal reserve system. As pointed out, however, in the report of the Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry, there is need for agricultural credits of an intermediate type, running from six months to three years, for production and marketing purposes. The farmers' turnover in the production of crops, including the planting, harvesting, and gradual marketing through orderly processes designed to avoid flooding the market at any one time, normally requires approximately 12 months; and in the live-stock industry the turnover may require as long as three years. Consequently, in order to make it possible for the farmer and live-stock man to liquidate, out of the ultimate proceeds of his agricultural transactions, his indebtedness incurred for production and marketing purposes, it is necessary that such indebtedness be permitted to run for periods ranging from six months to three years, depending upon the particular commodities being produced and marketed.

Loans with such maturities can not be granted in sufficient amounts to meet the needs of agriculture by ordinary banking institutions the liabilities of which are for the most part payable on demand, unless the banks can rely on being able to rediscount the loans in emergencies. The main purpose of the bill under consideration, as the Federal Reserve Board understands it, is to provide proper and adequate facilities for such rediscounts.

Bills have been introduced in Congress within the past year proposing to amend the Federal reserve act so as to make eligible for discount by Federal reserve banks agricultural paper with maturities up to 12 months, instead of 6 months, as the law now provides. The board has expressed its disapproval of these and similar bills, because the enactment of any such bill would materially lessen both the liquidity of the paper held by the Federal reserve banks and the elasticity of the Federal reserve note currency, which is based upon and secured by the paper so held. The bill recommended by the Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry avoids this danger, and at the same time offers far more adequate relief to the agricultural interests of the country than could be obtained through the enactment of such an amendment to the Federal reserve act.

The Federal Reserve Board has carefully examined the bill introduced in the Senate at S. 3051, and in the House of Representatives as H. R. 10058, and approves not only the purpose and substance of the bill but also the form and language that have been adopted in drafting it. The board is of the opinion that the bill is admirably designed to accomplish the purposes which its framers have in mind, and that its various provisions are so coordinated as to provide the most efficient machinery for the performance of the new functions of the Federal land banks without in any way interfering with their present activities.

Very truly yours,

W. P. G. HARDING, Governor.

Hon. GEORGE P. MCLEAN,
Chairman Committee on Banking and Currency,
United States Senate.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I did not hear all of the letter read. A part of it seemed to undertake to make the impression that the governor of the Federal Reserve Board, W. P. G. Harding, desired to aid the farmer and enable him to hold his products for profitable prices.

If that is true; if that is the impression sought to be made, the record of the Federal Reserve Board contradicts the professions which are contained in the letter just read. In 1920 the farmers of the South and West were denied money with which to carry on their business in a profitable manner; the merchants of the South and West, and the bankers of the South and West, were denied money necessary at the crop-moving time to aid the farmers of those sections in obtaining a fair and reasonable price for their products.

I said the other day, and I repeat now, that I do not intend that any statement which may come from the governor of the Federal Reserve Board that is contrary to the facts shall go into the RECORD unchallenged. If I caught the statement correctly, the governor of the Federal Reserve Board believes in permitting farmers to hold their produce until they can obtain a profitable price. Then, I repeat, his record is to the contrary. His conduct speaks louder than any expressions which he may use in writing to this body.

There are not thousands but millions of farmers who have been literally robbed of all they possess because they were denied the money and credit necessary to carry on their business as they were entitled to carry it on.

I said on day before yesterday, Mr. President, that the Federal Reserve Board permitted a progressive interest rate to be applied only to the agricultural sections. I want to add that when authority to invoke that progressive rate was granted it was obtained to some extent under false pretenses. Senators were told and Members of the House of Representatives were told that it was sought for the purpose of preventing big cities from getting more than their share of the money supply; that it was done to prevent speculation on exchanges; that it was done to prevent wild and reckless speculation in the big cities. Of course, those who came from the farming sections of the country thought that that would be a good idea—and it would have been—but when the Federal Reserve Board got the authority, how did they use it? They applied it only to the farming section.

Mr. President, the record bears me out in the statement that the Federal Reserve Board invoked the power in the district served by the Atlanta bank. That is right down in the heart of the cotton-growing region. They invoked it in the district served by the Dallas, Tex., bank, that bank being in the greatest cotton-producing State in the Union. They invoked it at St. Louis and at Kansas City, in the great farming districts served by those two banks. They did not invoke it in Wall Street; and there is where the great bulk of the speculation is carried on.

I repeat that Governor Harding, of the Federal Reserve Board, himself told the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] that it was done for the purpose of keeping the big speculative centers from getting money and to provide money in abundance to the farming sections of the country. I do not intend that the Federal Reserve Board shall now come in and seek a whitewash at the end of a miserable record while in their wake lie the wreck and ruin of thousands and millions of American people.

Again, I charge that the Federal Reserve Board head has been the enemy of every movement to aid the farmer. Section 2 of the joint resolution reviving the War Finance Corporation provided that the Federal Reserve Board should use its influence in having money loaned to farmers at the lowest rate of interest in keeping with sound banking. Could anyone object to a proposition of that sort? We were not asking that any wild-cat business be permitted but to let the farmers have money at the lowest rate of interest in keeping with sound banking; but the Federal Reserve Board used its "fine Italian hand" to defeat that legislation in the House. Congress revived the War Finance Corporation, but when the joint resolution came out of the House of Representatives section 2 had been stricken from the measure, so that Congress did not even request the Federal Reserve Board to permit money to be loaned to farmers in distress at the lowest rate of interest in keeping with sound banking.

Mr. President, do we all not know that if the Federal Reserve Board had been in favor of section 2 it would have remained in the joint resolution? Certainly it would; but it was stricken out.

The governor of the Federal Reserve Board appeared before the Committee on Agriculture at a joint session. I then was a member of the Agricultural Committee on the part of the other House. He opposed the revival of the War Finance Corporation. We did revive it and it has done good, but he did all he could to keep it from being revived. Did that look like he was a friend to the farmer?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am very glad to yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I remind the Senator from Alabama that the governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Ga., told the Senator and myself out in the reception room of the Senate the other day that he had \$100,000,000 of idle gold in his bank in that city. I asked him why he did not put it to work. He said it was because nobody wanted to borrow money. I should be glad if the Senator from Alabama would enlarge upon that subject in the course of his remarks.

Mr. HEFLIN. I will remind my friend from Georgia that I touched upon that subject briefly on day before yesterday. I remember the conversation to which the Senator from Georgia has referred. I remarked then that within a radius of 30 miles of Atlanta there were people in distress who wanted money and who would be glad to get it; and that there were not only

people there but there were people in my State and in the other Southern States who would be glad to borrow that money. Can it be that the Federal Reserve Board's deflation policy has hurt and seriously injured so many people that they live in dread and fear of this Federal Reserve Board?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. From all parts of the State of Georgia I have received letters almost every day asking if the Government will not provide some method by which they can borrow money to carry on their business?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, that is in keeping with the information I have. People are writing me that they can not get money to carry on their business. This year there are farmers in the South and in the West who can not get money to make a crop. Their business is dying upon their hands. Now, I want to know why it is that, although the Federal reserve banks have the money, they say they can not lend it.

Does not that prove what I have charged here for months, that while they were taking this blood money in they were forcing the farmers to dispose of their crops upon the market at destructive prices in order to make them liquidate? Of course it proves that.

Where did the Federal reserve banks get this money. I have said they were compelling the farmers to pay their loans; that the word had gone down the line to call upon them to settle up, and the officers of the Federal Reserve Board denied it; but now they come out and say, "We have more money than we know what to do with." Yet here in the United States, the greatest Government in all the world, with the greatest gold supply of any country upon the earth, with more gold than we know what to do with, there are sixty-odd millions of our people in distress.

Senators, it is a sad picture to look upon. What are we going to do? Who, like Aaron of old, will stretch forth the healing rod to give the land deliverance? I rejoice that the day is not far distant when the head of this board shall pass from the position which he holds and has used to the detriment and injury of millions of American people. His term expires in August.

Mr. President, there has never been a greater crime committed against the public, in my judgment, than that of deflation in 1920. Abraham Lincoln spoke the living truth when he said:

If you force people to pay with a deflated dollar a debt incurred under an inflated dollar, you are guilty of a crime.

I have heretofore given an illustration of the result of the deflation policy, but I want to repeat it here this afternoon. A farmer in my State who made 10 bales of cotton contracted an indebtedness on it to the extent of \$2,000. That 10 bales of cotton would have paid the debt at the time it was incurred, but the price of cotton was beaten down until when the dollar had been deflated the 10 bales paid only \$500 of the debt, leaving three-fourths of it still due. At that rate it would take the farmer four years under deflation to make cotton enough to pay a debt incurred under inflation in one year. That is the sort of work that has been done. I am endeavoring to show just what sort of ruin was wrought under that policy. Why did they apply the progressive interest rates to the bank of Atlanta and not apply it to the bank of New York? Why did they apply it to the bank of Dallas and the bank of Atlanta, which serve the great cotton belt of the United States, when they kept their hands off of the bank in New York, in the heart of the gambling district? Let them answer that question.

Mr. President, I have charged here repeatedly, and I charge again, that there was a conspiracy to rob the cotton producers of the United States of the crop of 1920, and they were robbed of it. Here was the farmer coming into the market place in 1920 with a crop of cotton which cost him more than any crop he had ever produced, and here were the gamblers of Wall Street seeking to beat down the price.

The farmer, as he had done in 1918 and 1919, went to the members of the Federal reserve banking system and said, "I want money to hold my cotton back until I can get the cost of production, plus a profit. I got money for this purpose in 1918 and in 1919; I must have it now." But the appeal fell on deaf ears.

The Federal Reserve Board had decreed that the cotton crop of 1920 should be denied the currency and credits necessary to compel a fair price. The Federal reserve banks, under orders from the board, said "no," and they shut the door in the face of the farmer. Then what happened? Cotton went down and down. The farmer came back and said, "We can not sell at this figure; if we do we are ruined; we must have money." He

went again to the Federal reserve banks, but under orders from the board the banks said, "If you get it, you will have to pay 15 per cent, or 25 per cent, or 35 per cent," and even 87½ per cent, which was the rate charged in the case of a little bank in my State. What was that doing? That was making it impossible for the farmer to get any money, and when they made it impossible for the farmer to get any money, what happened to him? He stood empty-handed and helpless in the market place, and the gamblers fleeced him and took his crop from him.

Why did they apply the progressive interest rate to the Atlanta, Dallas, St. Louis, and Kansas City Federal Reserve Banks, serving the great agricultural districts, and fail to apply it to Boston, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and New York, and the other four regional banks? Why did they not apply it to the speculating section of New England, one of the great cotton-spinning sections of the country? The spinner could sell all the cotton he wanted on the bear side to beat down the price; he could get all the money he wanted to carry on his speculative transactions; but the farmer of the South could not get it to fight that gambler. They applied the progressive rate to him. They ran it up to 7 per cent first, and he said: "Well, I must have some money." They said: "Do you want to pay 15, 25, 35, 40 per cent?" The farmer, merchant, and banker in the agricultural sections had his business practically destroyed.

There is nothing too strong to say about that criminal conduct. The whole policy grew out of the resolution introduced into this Chamber and passed at the instance of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick]. It opened the way for the deflation policy; and then the Federal Reserve Board, bowing and scraping to the party that it knew would come into power, in order that it might retain its place, carried out the policy.

Why, Mr. President, do you not know that if that board had not been performing entirely in a satisfactory way, the leader from Illinois, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick] would have had every one of its members removed?

Mr. McCormick. Mr. President, the Senator flatters me in including me among the world-wide economic causes of the present depression. I am overcome to be classed with reparations and armaments and devastation in northern France as one of the fundamental reasons for the depression throughout the country and the world.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois can not escape with that sort of an excuse. There was no excuse for the depression that was produced here. We had the money, we had the credit, we had the ability to finance the World War, and this board boasted at that time that we could expand and inflate still more and never endanger the gold reserve at all. We stood through the war, and then, when the wolves of Wall Street commenced to howl for their feast, they got ready to deflate so that they could make not only their millions, their hundreds of millions, but their billions out of the South and West, and they made them. The Senator from Illinois may have been entirely innocent as to the effect that this thing was going to have, but he was unfortunately the instrumentality that opened the way for this long train of misery and ruin that we find in the United States; and W. P. G. Harding, the Federal Reserve Board governor, wrote a letter, in response to the Senator's resolution, promising that they would use every power at their command to carry out the purposes of the deflation resolution, and he certainly kept his promise.

They wrought ruin in the South and in the West. The evidence of that ruin is there to speak for itself, Mr. President. The country is in distress; industries are shut down; 7,000,000 laborers have been turned out of employment; farming operations have been made unprofitable; farmers' farms have been taken from them; dire distress is reigning in the country; and every time we defeat one of the Republican reactionaries the Senator from Illinois gets up here and demands that the League of Nations be made the issue.

Mr. McCormick. Every time what happens?

Mr. HEFLIN. Every time we defeat one of the reactionaries, such as my good friend Congressman Copley, a clever gentleman, but one of the standpatters of the old school.

Mr. McCormick. Mr. President, the Senator forgets that Mr. Copley supported Colonel Roosevelt in three successive campaigns, and even left the Republican Party in doing so.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then, Mr. President, if he had stayed out he might have been renominated. He went back to the old lick log and they slaughtered him. He has been a good reactionary for quite a while in the House. Mr. Roosevelt has been gone for some time. Mr. Copley is a very wealthy man, and he was going right along with the reactionary program, and he got defeated for renomination a few days ago; and my friend from Illinois came in here and lifted his voice nearly as loud as he did this afternoon and said that we must make the League

of Nations the issue, and on yesterday—he has been quiet now for two or three weeks—

Mr. McCORMICK. That is more than can be said for the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. Why, I have not said anything in over a month except on day before yesterday, when I was compelled to talk about your deflation policy.

Mr. McCORMICK. And the day before that.

Mr. HEFLIN. Not the day before that.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator was out of town, perhaps.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have been right here, but the Senator has been away.

And on yesterday, Mr. President, when our genial friend—and we all are exceedingly fond of Senator New—was defeated, a strong administration candidate, the Senator from Illinois comes in, and, louder and stronger than ever before, demands that we make the League of Nations the issue.

Mr. President, I do not blame the Senator. It shows how shrewd and cunning he is. He says: "Why, they are whipping us on the record that we are making here in Congress. Let us make the League of Nations the issue."

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator let me interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. HEFLIN. I shall be glad to be interrupted by the Senator because I am anxious to help him out of this amusing predicament in which he finds himself.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will the Senator let me call to his attention the absence from the Chamber of any Democratic Senators from north of the Mason and Dixon line who are candidates for reelection, now that the League of Nations is before the Senate? Perhaps the Senator will ask his colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] if he will not join Governor Cox in demanding that the Democratic National Committee reaffirm the Democratic faith that we should subscribe to the covenant of the treaty of Versailles, and integrally enforce the treaty of Versailles.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield—

Mr. HEFLIN. I shall be glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I feel sorry, very sorry, for my good friend from Illinois. I realize that the issues under which his party friends are meeting defeat are issues that he would gladly get away from, as has been suggested by my colleague. I have heard him refer once or twice to me on this question of the League of Nations.

Mr. McCORMICK. When?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This afternoon, specifically; but that is all right.

Of course I can not speak for anyone but myself, and I do not intend to speak for anyone but myself; but I will remind the Senator from Illinois that some weeks ago, when I stood in my place in the Senate advocating the ratification of the four-power pact as presented to the Senate by the President of the United States, I said that I did so because the principle involved was the same principle that made me vote for the ratification of the treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations. I said at that time that I had the proud opportunity, when the treaty of Versailles was before the Senate, to make the motion for the unconditional ratification of that treaty. I was proud to do it then, and I have been proud of it ever since. I have believed that one of the great mistakes this Government has made—one of the greatest mistakes that stands to its record in all its history—was the fact that it failed to ratify the treaty of Versailles and take its place among its allies in settling the shattered conditions of Europe, and take its place at the only table at which these questions could be settled, and assist in saving the world from the disordered political conditions of Europe, the disordered financial conditions of Europe, and the disastrous business conditions of Europe that confront the world to-day and have shattered American finance and American business. That is my viewpoint of the matter, and I have no apologies to make for it.

As to the issues in the campaign, men do not make issues. Conditions make great political issues and men fight for them or against them. I want to say to the Senator that I have known of no apology on the part of the Democratic Party for its position in favor of the League of Nations, and I certainly have no desire to make any; but, notwithstanding the desire of the Senator from Illinois to make that the dominant issue in the next campaign, the dominant issue will be the mistakes of his own party in passing a financial bill increasing the burdens of taxation on the American people, failing to relieve the business interests of this country from undue burdens of taxation, and failing to bring down the expenditures of the Government to a point even approximating those that existed before the war.

Of course you have reduced expenditures somewhat. You took charge of this Government, so far as controlling the House of Representatives was concerned, and the purse strings of the Nation, the week that the armistice was signed, and yet we have war expenditures still appropriated for to-day, and taxes must be raised to meet them. How can you expect the American people to think only of the covenant of the League of Nations when you are burdening them with these immense appropriations and failing to reduce the oppressive taxes that rest upon their backs—taxes and burdens of appropriation that have shattered business—when you have woe in the home and poverty in the street?

That is the reason why the Senator can not make the League of Nations the sole issue in the coming campaign. It is because his party on the live issues of the hour, the issues of to-day, has failed to make good before the American people:

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator considers the League of Nations a dead issue?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I said the live issues of the hour, which are made by the Senator's party. Of course, the Senator knows, just as I know, that the treaty of Versailles is in the White House, and that there is no chance to make it an issue unless the President of the United States will send it here. He has the power to send it back. He will not send it back, and therefore he prevents any action on the part of this Government with reference to the matter; but even if he sent it back, and if it were ratified now, it would be too late to meet the issue and save the situation, which could have been saved if the treaty had been promptly ratified when it first came before the Senate of the United States.

Mr. McCORMICK. Let me ask the Senator a question to see if I understand him. He agrees, then, with the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the former governor of Ohio, that ultimately the United States ought to subscribe to the covenant of the League of Nations?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not speaking as agreeing with anybody; I am expressing my own views on this subject, and I think I have done so clearly. I do not say, and do not contend, that the treaty of Versailles and the covenant of the League of Nations will be the issue in the coming campaign. I have no apologies for my action in regard to that matter, and nothing to take back. I know it will not be the leading and foremost issue, because the mistakes, within the last year and a half, of the Senator's own party so overshadow everything else in the political arena that you could not make anything else the issue before the American people if you tried.

The administration will go to the country on the test as to whether it has made good in its financial and business promises before the people of the United States, and the verdict is bound to be, the verdict is in every mouth and every home and every office to-day, that you have failed to make good.

Mr. McCORMICK. Having failed in that, will the Senator tell me whether or not he believes, with Governor Cox and the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], that ultimately we ought to subscribe to the covenant of the League of Nations?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Ultimately? I say now; I do not say ultimately.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from Alabama is not so hasty.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I said to the Senator that I voted for the unconditional ratification of the treaty.

Mr. McCORMICK. That was two years ago.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And I have never apologized for it. I myself think that our proper place to-day would be in the League of Nations. That is my viewpoint. But I say that even if we went in to-day, it would not relieve any of the disaster which came to the world and this country because of the failure of the United States Senate to ratify that treaty.

Mr. McCORMICK. I thank the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] for his courtesy in yielding.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, my colleague has made a very strong and clear statement. Of course, he could not convince the Senator from Illinois. Every time a reactionary is defeated for election to the House or Senate the Senator from Illinois is going to come in and demand the League of Nations as an issue, because he saw his party triumph upon that issue—that is, it had something to do with it, I suppose. But I want to remind the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois, one of the leaders on the other side, that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW], our clever, good friend, who was defeated on Tuesday, voted against the League of Nations. Where is the saving grace in opposition to the League of Nations, that is such a burning issue now, that it could not save the Senator from Indiana on Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from Indiana did not vote against the League of Nations.

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly he voted against the League of Nations issue.

Mr. McCORMICK. No; he did not.

Mr. HEFLIN. Did he vote for it?

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Beveridge was against it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Senator New, I understand, voted against the League of Nations.

Mr. McCORMICK. No; he did not.

Mr. HEFLIN. Did he vote against the Versailles treaty?

Mr. McCORMICK. He voted to ratify the League of Nations with reservations.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Illinois says the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] voted for the League of Nations with reservations.

Mr. McCORMICK. He did.

Mr. HARRISON. There were a good many Senators on the other side who voted that way. Are they still of that opinion, that it should be ratified with reservations?

Mr. McCORMICK. I think not.

Mr. HARRISON. Why does the Senator think not?

Mr. McCORMICK. I think the President, speaking from yonder place, defined the position of the party and of a majority of the Senators on this side. He has twice declared, for himself, and, I think, for the majority of the party, upon that issue.

Mr. HARRISON. The President, when he was a Senator, voted for the League of Nations with reservations.

Mr. McCORMICK. I am speaking of the President as President, not as Senator. I ask the Senator from Alabama to excuse me for having interrupted him.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator. The Senator is in an awful fix, and I want to help him out of it if I can.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] voted against the League of Nations. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] offered it without reservations, and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] voted against it. That is his record; that is his position upon it.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator does not mean that the Senator from Indiana did not vote for it with reservations?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not remember how he voted on the death-dealing blow, the Lodge reservations, which finally put it to sleep.

Mr. SHEPPARD. He voted for it with the Lodge reservations.

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; he voted for it with those reservations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Lodge reservations cut the heart out of the league.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If my colleague would like to have the vote that was cast on that occasion, I can give it to him, and he can read it into the RECORD if he wishes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; and the RECORD shows that Senator New voted against it.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator, however, that ex-Senator Beveridge, who defeated Senator New, was against the League of Nations. He was against it with reservations attached to it, and he opposed it in every possible way.

Mr. HARRISON. Was that an issue out there?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Alabama has brought it up as an issue here.

Mr. HARRISON. I am asking the Senator from Utah if that was an issue between Mr. Beveridge and Mr. New?

Mr. SMOOT. I can not say.

Mr. HEFLIN. I never knew of it as an issue out there.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator mentioned it here, and spoke of Senator New being defeated.

Mr. HEFLIN. I knew the Senator from Utah would come to the rescue of the other leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK].

Mr. SMOOT. I am not a leader.

Mr. HEFLIN. I think he ought to stay out and let the Senator from Illinois get out the best way he can. As I said before, he started this League of Nations discussion. I think the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has all he can do in defending these tariff schedules he has brought in here, which just simply rob the people of this whole country. He is getting off now talking about something else which does not pertain to these people who are having such a hard struggle to live at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has made an argument based on the fact that the Senator from Indiana was defeated in the primary in Indiana, and he is seeking to connect the result

with the League of Nations. But the man who defeated him was not only opposed to the League of Nations as it was submitted, but he was opposed to the League of Nations with any kind of an amendment, and he would not have anything to do with it in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. HEFLIN. That does not enter into this.

Mr. SMOOT. It did enter into the Senator's argument.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask the Senator from Illinois, whose opposition to the league is so strong and mighty, why did not the position of Senator NEW save him Tuesday in the primary election?

Mr. SMOOT. Because Mr. Beveridge, who beat him, was stronger against it than Mr. NEW was.

Mr. HEFLIN. But they did not mention the league in the campaign, I understand.

Mr. SMOOT. Then why does the Senator bring it up?

Mr. HEFLIN. Why did it help Mr. Beveridge any if they did not mention it?

Mr. SMOOT. I am not saying it did. The Senator is trying to bring in the question here.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am reminded that the vote in the NEWBERRY case had a great deal to do with it.

Mr. SMOOT. Do not try to dodge the question, which is the League of Nations.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am not dodging. I am giving one of the vital issues to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Do not dodge the question of the League of Nations. That is what we were discussing.

Mr. HEFLIN. The League of Nations—there he goes! He has gone off after the League of Nations, too. We are going to try you upon the vital issues of the hour.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what we want.

Mr. HEFLIN. Upon the domestic concerns of our long-suffering people.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what we would like.

Mr. HEFLIN. We will accommodate the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. There was nothing in what the Senator from Illinois said that caused me to rise. I was replying to what the Senator from Alabama said.

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I never mentioned the League of Nations, with the exception of calling the attention of the Senator from Alabama to the fact that the opposition of the Senator from Indiana to the League of Nations, or his being in favor of it, had nothing whatever to do with his defeat, because of the fact that ex-Senator Beveridge was opposed to the League of Nations in every way.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the league was an issue at all, and if the people were so much aroused over the league and about it, and felt as the Senator from Illinois frequently leads us to believe they feel, would they not have said, "We do not care how Beveridge feels. Senator NEW voted against the thing. We are going to send him back because he did."

Mr. SMOOT. But he voted for it with reservations.

Mr. HEFLIN. He voted just as the Senator from Utah voted. The Senator from Utah voted for it, with reservations, did he not? The Senator from Utah voted against it without reservations, did he not?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I voted against it without reservations.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then the Senator voted against the League of Nations.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly, I did; and I would do it again. But the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] voted for the league with reservations, and ex-Senator Beveridge would not have voted for it even with the reservations.

Mr. MOSES. May I seek a little enlightenment of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am glad always to enlighten my friend from New Hampshire, because I think he, like the Senator from Illinois, is entitled to a good supply of that material.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator has been referring to recent political events frequently in the course of the afternoon in this language, "Whenever we beat a reactionary." Whom does he mean by "we"? Does he mean that the Democrats beat Senator NEW or Representative COPLEY in a Republican primary?

Mr. HEFLIN. Not at all; but I was speaking about when the administration received a rebuke, when a candidate who is supporting the administration is defeated, and when some man runs in your primary who says that he is opposed to what is going on up here, that he wants to come up here and do this, that, and the other, that is not now being done. When he comes out of the political arena bearing off the laurels of the day, it is repudiation. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. MOSES. Let me ask the Senator, further, if he thinks that Mr. Beveridge and the gentleman who won the nomination from Mr. COPLEY will be antiadministration when they get here?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not know. Frequently a Republican gets a nomination in the primary and changes his position after he gets here, as my friend from New Hampshire did on the bonus.

Mr. MOSES. I hope they will have the manhood to state their positions.

Mr. HEFLIN. I think they should, and that we should not have to make them acknowledge their positions.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator did not make me state anything. I stated it of my own volition.

Mr. HEFLIN. I remember very well that the Senator did do that voluntarily; that is, the Senator was speaking, and I reminded him of that, and he admitted it.

Mr. MOSES. No; I stated it in the opening sentence of my speech.

Mr. HEFLIN. I believe the Senator is correct about that. If so capable and brave a Senator as my good friend from New Hampshire will tell them one thing in the primary and vote another when he gets here, what may we expect from feeble fellows who happen to get nominated?

Mr. MOSES. In my case, I have always put them on notice.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator put them on notice after he had been nominated and got the election, and had his certificate in his pocket.

Mr. MOSES. In ample time so that they would know before the vote was taken.

Mr. HEFLIN. In ample time before the next election.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator is welcome to come up in my State and raise that question.

Mr. HEFLIN. Oh, Mr. President, I am not seeking to get up in the Senator's State and raise that question against him. I want to raise the questions here, in the forum of the people. Let us go out and fight out the issues on which we are battling now, and not let the Senator from Illinois lead us back down under the hill, where the people can not see and hear. We want to fight this domestic issue out on the mountain top.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. I take this occasion to remark to the Senator from New Hampshire that the fight to which he refers in Illinois is purely a family affair in the Republican Party. I do not see any special significance in that election to either Democrats or Republicans. The best information I can get is that Brother Corley dried up and blew away. I do not know whether the Senator will differ with me in that respect or not.

Mr. MOSES. They are not saying on the other side of the Chamber in respect to that matter that "we defeated the reactionaries."

Mr. STANLEY. I did not shed any tears.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Republican Party this morning when they got that news from Indiana did not know whether to move forward, step back, stand still, or sit down. They reminded me of the country boy who was doing some stunts with hen eggs one night. He had the audience sitting out in front, with these little Japanese lanterns such as they burn on the porch at night. He said: "I am going to do with eggs what you have seen done with white balls frequently. I will keep seven of them going in the air at once." He performed that remarkable stunt, and they sat in wide-eyed astonishment as the little fellow pulled off the stunt. Then he said, laying the eggs all down upon the table, "Now, I am going to do another thing. I am going to pitch one of them into my mouth at arm's length, never striking my teeth or breaking the egg."

Just as he whirled the egg old Uncle Johnny, sitting there holding his whiskers in front of him and chewing his end, turned his chair over and fell. The boy slipped a cog, his mind being distracted from his business, and he swallowed the egg. A friend rushed to him and said, "Jimmy, shall I send for the doctor?" Jimmy said, "Don't touch me. I don't know what to do. If I move it will break, and if I stand still it will hatch." [Laughter.]

So it is with our Republican friends. They are in an awful predicament, but most of them smile and enjoy it and take it good-naturedly, like my friend the Senator from New Hampshire, but it is going to hurt the Senator from Illinois, and he is not going to be able to survive more than two or three more jolts of this character. Every time the news comes in that one of them has been beaten he walks down the aisle to the altar place in front of the Vice President, whirls viciously toward the Democratic side and says, "I challenge you to make the League of Nations the issue." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, we have issues enough already formed by the present administration upon which to go to the country. I remind the Senator from Illinois and the profiteers who flourish

in rank luxuriance to-day with their taxes all taken off. I remind him of the distress wrought by his deflation policy. I remind him of the millions of men yet unemployed. I remind him of the distress to be found in every line of business. I remind him of the unrest that we see all about us, a discontented, unhappy, and yet determined people. Mr. President, they are aroused as they have not been for years. "Weighed in the balance and found wanting." That will be the verdict they will render.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to take just a moment of the time of the Senate. I have not been very much alarmed at what the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has stated, and has repeated every day or two in this Chamber for weeks past. I am not alarmed over what the issues will be in the coming campaign. I am not alarmed over what is going to happen to the Republican Party for what are denominated the mistakes of the party and this administration. Before the campaign is over the American people will know just exactly the condition in which the Republican Party found the country when they took charge of the administration of the Government.

Talk about burdensome taxes? Of course, they are burdensome. In 1918 I stood at my desk here and told the American people that the taxes for the next quarter of a century would never be less than \$3,000,000,000. On retiring from office in what condition did the Democratic Party leave the country? How did they leave it? In what financial condition was the country left in by them? The interest upon our obligations, the amount that is absolutely necessary to take care of the wounded soldiers, and the sinking fund required by a law passed by the last administration, of which law I approved, constitute nearly \$2,000,000,000 every year. This amount must be raised by taxation without providing a cent for running expenses of the Government.

The attention of the American people will be called to this. The attention of the American people will be called to the conditions which exist in the world to-day. The American people know, so far as the business of their own country is concerned, that it is generally struggling to make ends meet, and successful concerns making little money on which to pay taxes and necessarily rates of taxation could be reduced but little. Burdensome? Of course the taxes are burdensome, but when the American people know the amount that this administration has saved in cutting down the appropriations which have been so carelessly and wickedly made in the past I think there will be no question as to what the verdict of the American people will be.

I am not alarmed in the least, and, so far as I am concerned, I do not believe it will be the League of Nations that will be the great issue. I believe that the dominating question in the campaign will be the expenditures of public money, and how the money is to be raised to meet the same.

Mr. President, I think if the Democrats will allow the tariff bill to be passed in time that it can operate before the day of election, there is no question as to what the verdict of the people will be. The result will be a revival of business, slowly, I will admit, with the existing tariff law in force much longer. We would have to be looking around for different kinds of taxation, taxes that have never been thought of in the past, to lay upon the backs of the people. The rates in the tariff bill are only such as will fairly protect the American business man, and if they do not protect him I know just what will happen. It will result in exactly what the pending law resulted in before the breaking out of the war. I say now that if it had not been for the war the existing tariff law would never have been on the statute books longer than it was possible for the American people to render a verdict upon it, and the Republican Party to have time to make a new tariff bill. When the war broke out the balance of trade against the United States was increasing rapidly, taking importations and exportations into consideration. I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that, before the breaking out of the war, month after month we were running behind at the rate of \$62,000,000 a month. It would not have taken very long until the country would have been in a worse condition than it was in the nineties, and I think that the American people realize it, and that the only thing which saved them was the declaration of war.

Mr. President, so far as the Republican Party is concerned, we are perfectly willing to meet the issue, and I feel confident and assured that the American people before the campaign is over will understand the situation, and I have no fear whatever as to the result.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, a gentleman sitting in the Chamber yesterday, who is a considerable mathematician, sent me a little note. This note read as follows:

Listening to these heroic efforts on the part of some Senators to do everything in their power to expedite the consideration and passage of this bill, I have evolved the following algebraic problem to ascertain

at the present rate of progress just when the committee amendments will be disposed of.

Given these facts: The bill has been under consideration for 13 days. Three amendments have been acted upon. There are 2,000 committee amendments reported.

Then, making his calculation, he proceeds:

Not counting Sundays or legal holidays, the last amendment should be agreed to on September 29, 1946.

I think, Mr. President, after listening to the debate to-day he would have to revise his figures and add 30 or 40 more years to the date he gave for final action upon the committee amendments.

Now, Mr. President, ever since I was old enough to read any of the debates of Congress, and I began perhaps in the early seventies to take an interest in them, I have found that whenever a tariff bill was up for consideration which had for its purpose protection to American industries we had the same expression that we have to-day, "monstrosity." We had the same expressions of condemnation and denunciation. They all come back to me through the years, echoing the same sentiments, and connected with them was always the same threat, that the Republican Party was going to be wiped off the face of the earth. Notwithstanding the threats, notwithstanding the adjectives which were used, the Republican Party and the protective policy have held for about five-sixths of the time since 1860.

Now, I do not know whether its life will continue or not. I do know this, however, that braggadocio, blowing what we are going to do or what we would do, is not going to change the minds of the American people very much. If the bill is satisfactory to them, if it will bring about any revival of business, I have no doubt that the American people will continue in power those who have sponsored the bill and this character of legislation. If it fails to produce that result there may be a reversal.

All I know is that the platform of the last Republican national convention declared strongly for the reinstatement of the American protective policy. I know that President Harding was elected by a very great majority. I am not one of those who claim, or will admit, that the principal issue which caused the defeat of the Democratic Party and of Governor Cox was the League of Nations or any other single issue, for in our own platform we came out strongly for an association of nations to preserve the peace of the world. Nothing was said as to how such an association should or should not be constituted. I have no doubt in the world that there was a very strong feeling against Mr. Wilson's League of Nations, and that it did materially affect the result in that election, although I favored the League of Nations, with proper reservations; but there were other questions involved.

I do not think that in the beginning the American people wanted to become involved in the World War, and the cry of those who favored Mr. Wilson's election in 1916 that "he had kept us out of war" had a great deal to do with his return to power at that time. Then we entered the war, and there was something of a revulsion of feeling on the part of a great many of the American people on account of the fact that, having been returned to power on that assumption, the then administration immediately went into war.

There were many other considerations which influenced the election. There were a great many considerations outside of the tariff question and the League of Nations question and the keeping us out of war question which had their due and proper weight in bringing about a change of administration. However, there prevailed throughout the sentiment, "Now that we are out of the war we want to get back to a protective policy."

I believe the American people as a rule are in favor of a protective policy. If any item of the pending bill goes beyond what is reasonably protective, then it should be discussed and be changed if Senators on the other side can convince us we are wrong. Then, let us put the bill through; let us get rid of this tariff legislation and go home and let the American people pass judgment upon whether or not the Republican Party should be retained in power. If we have made a mistake, let us go ahead and at least submit the matter to the judgment of the people after we have put our bill upon the statute books.

I want to get through with this bill. I think it is a disgrace to the American Senate that after a bill has been brought into the body there is no power in the Senate to compel Senators to discuss the bill under consideration, but that any Senator may enter upon the discussion of any question he may see fit to discuss.

The pending bill has not been discussed during the last 14 days one-fifth of the time it has been before the Senate. The discussion has continually branched off on some extraneous matters. I hope Senators will consider the bill now and will make it in reality the unfinished business.

If we do not pass the bill in due time, I will tell Senators what is going to happen. They may consume hours and days in discussion and keep that up for a month or two, and then suddenly they will get tired of hearing their own voices; suddenly the Senate itself will demand immediate action, and before we shall have considered more than one-third of the bill Senators will be ready to swallow all the remainder of it in order to get away.

I had rather Senators would discuss every one of the items of the bill and get through with them. I think that is the logical and the only legitimate way to discuss a tariff bill. Mr. President, we can not handle the bill by holding only day sessions if the discussion is to continue for weeks.

Mr. CURTIS rose.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will yield in a moment. I do not want to ask for night sessions. I think if we do our morning work and then meet at 11 o'clock and remain in session until 6 o'clock in the afternoon we shall have done a good, honest day's work, and that we ought to have a little time for rest; but if Senators are going to insist upon discussing every subject on earth except the tariff bill, there is but one method by which we can meet the situation, and that is to insist that we shall have not only day sessions but that we shall also hold night sessions.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. I rose before the Senator from North Dakota said that he did not care to resort to night sessions to suggest that we hold night sessions beginning on next Monday night. I think a few night sessions would get the bill through.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I will say in answer to that suggestion that I think, if we give our attention to the bill, it will not be necessary to hold night sessions at all; and I certainly should not consider it necessary to ask for evening sessions unless such a course seemed imperative in order to make progress with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I have taken up very little time during the discussion of the tariff bill. I spoke for about 20 minutes the other day on a matter of very grave importance to the farmers of the entire United States; and I spoke to-day briefly about a matter which affects the whole American people, and that is the control of the money supply and the credits of the country. If Senators can not speak upon such matters when they are presented for consideration there is no use to wait for two or three weeks and then speak on them.

I wish to say further to the Senator from North Dakota—

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me say that I am making no complaint against the Senator from Alabama. On the contrary, I think the first injection of extraneous matters into the debate this afternoon was from this side of the Chamber. We have, however, nevertheless, discussed nearly all matters except the bill which is nominally under consideration.

I know how deeply the Senator from Alabama is interested in questions affecting the mode of operation of the Federal reserve banks, but inasmuch as the tariff bill is now the real matter before the Senate, I am simply pleading that from now we may proceed with the consideration of that measure.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am in hearty agreement with the Senator about that. I do not think that there is any disposition over here to filibuster at all; certainly there is none on my part. I should like to see the tariff bill passed on within a month's time, and probably that may be done; but I submit that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] have been discussing the tariff measure hour after hour and pointing out the provisions of the bill which they think are very objectionable. The American people are entitled to know what is in this bill. They can not pass on it intelligently unless its provisions are explained to them. Here is a bill containing very many items and provisions, and unless it is very thoroughly discussed the people will not know what is in it until after the election. I think the time the Senate has devoted to discussing the measure as it has been discussed by the Senators to whom I have referred is time well spent, for certainly those who represent the people here are entitled to take all the time they think necessary to show Congress and then to the people the obnoxious provisions contained in the bill.

I wish to say for the benefit of the senior Senator from North Dakota that some Republican newspapers in the West have denounced this bill as the worst tariff bill that has ever been submitted to Congress, and many Republicans in the country, I

understand, feel the same way about it. If they do, they are entitled to have the matter fairly and thoroughly discussed.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I agree with him as to that. I want the measure discussed, but the complaint that I am urging is that it has not been discussed; that other subjects have taken nearly all of the time.

Mr. HEFLIN. I differ from my good friend from North Dakota as to that. I have heard the discussion, and it seems to me that two-thirds of the time day after day have been consumed in the discussion of the tariff bill.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no; the Senator is mistaken. I do not think that one hour out of five has been spent in the discussion of the tariff bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. I can not agree with the Senator as to that. I know that it has long been the custom for the Senator having the floor to discuss a pending measure to yield for the transaction of some other business that must be transacted. That has been done, of course, during the discussion of the tariff bill, but I think that this measure has been discussed as consistently, if not more so, than any measure which has been before the body since I have been here.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, it is my intention to ask the Senate to continue in session until 6 o'clock this evening, but I have some assurance that to-morrow we will really consider the tariff bill. There are Senators who desire to get away. So I ask that when the Senate concludes its business on this calendar day it shall take a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NAT GOLDSTEIN.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, there is a very interesting article in the New York Times of this morning. It is found in the third column on the front page, and I should like to have it read from the Secretary's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

WASHINGTON, May 3.—President Harding sent to the Senate to-day the nomination of Nat Goldstein to be collector of internal revenue for the first (St. Louis) district of Missouri. In doing so the President laid the foundation for political trouble, for Goldstein is one of two men whose acceptance of money to further the campaign of Frank O. Lowden, then governor of Illinois, for the Republican nomination for President had most to do with losing Lowden this honor.

Some Republican Senators were plainly disconcerted when they learned that Goldstein had been nominated. With the incident of the 1920 campaign in mind, they felt that a party error had been made in this selection.

"Good Lord, can it be true?" exclaimed one Senator when told of the nomination. That the naming of Goldstein will furnish Democrats with some high explosive ammunition goes without saying. In a measure the nomination seems likely to become a second Newberry case, and the expectation is that some Republican Senators will join with the Democrats in opposing confirmation.

The nomination will be referred to the Committee on Finance, the Republican members of which are McCUMBER, SMOOT, LA FOLLETTE, DILLINGHAM, MCLEAN, CURTIS, WATSON, CALDER, SUTHERLAND, and FRIEDLHAYSEN. Among the Democratic Senators is Senator REED, who is having strong opposition in his effort to be renominated. If he should be named to run again, the Goldstein case will give him a new campaign issue. The other Democratic members of the committee are HITCHCOCK, WILLIAMS, SWANSON, POMERENE, PITTMAN, and SHIELDS.

Called before a Senate committee of investigation on June 2, 1920, Robert E. Moore, of St. Louis, and Goldstein admitted that each had received a check for \$2,500 from Jacob Babler, national committeeman from Missouri, before the election of delegates to the Republican National Convention, and that each understood that it was Lowden money. Moore testified that Babler handed him the check "to take it and use it for whatever I (Moore) saw fit," but that he had not used it. The money was still to his credit in a bank, he said, but in view of the unpleasant notoriety which the matter had caused he would return it.

Goldstein, then a circuit court clerk in St. Louis, testified that Babler handed him a check for \$2,500; that he had put it to his credit in bank; that his intention was to turn it over to the Lowden organization "when we got into the campaign," if Lowden were nominated, or return the money if Lowden were not nominated. Goldstein said that when the money was given to him he was a candidate for delegate to the national convention, and subsequently was elected without instructions. He added that he "was friendly to Governor Lowden's interests."

Other testimony was to the effect that Louis L. Emmerson, secretary of state of Illinois and Governor Lowden's campaign manager, sent to E. L. Morse, the Lowden campaign manager in Missouri, \$32,000 to pay expenses in his attempt to carry Missouri. Morse testified that he gave \$17,000 of this amount to Babler "to create Lowden sentiment." All the testimony showed that Governor Lowden had no knowledge of those transactions. He issued a statement in which he repudiated the support of Moore and Goldstein. "My injunctions to Mr. Emmerson were to use no money except for legitimate purposes of the campaign and to make no expenditure that could not be made public," he said.

The whole affair created such a furor that the Republican leaders at the Chicago convention were afraid to throw the presidential nomi-

nation to Lowden. Of the leading contestants for the nomination, General Wood, Senator Harding, Senator JOHNSON, and Governor Lowden, the favorite with the leaders was Lowden.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, in view of that statement from that very reputable paper, if there is such a nomination here, there will be a motion made to have the nomination considered in open executive session.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate at this late hour. I was out of the Senate Chamber, in a committee meeting, when the article from some paper was read concerning Mr. Nat Goldstein.

I merely want to say at this time that I have known Mr. Goldstein for 25 years. He is now, and has been for some years, the clerk of the circuit court of the city of St. Louis. He is a man of the highest integrity, a man whom judges and lawyers and business men of the community would vouch for. I am sure, as they have to me, in large numbers. When the time comes I shall be very glad to give to the Senate any information that any Senator may desire to hear about him.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield before he takes his seat, let me say that in view of what the Senator has said I am sure he will cooperate with me and others who may desire to have this matter discussed in open executive session, and, when the motion is made to have it discussed in open executive session, that he will vote for it.

Mr. SPENCER. I am inclined to think that nominations had better be discussed, as they always have been, in executive session. I know how often the Senator from Mississippi has desired to have many nominations discussed in open session; but my judgment has rather been with the majority of the Senate, that it is better to conform ourselves to what has been the custom ever since I have been here.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator would not like to make this an exception to that rule? If this article and these rumors that are current have done Mr. Goldstein so much injury, then he should have a right to have his case discussed in the open. It would seem fair to him that we should do it, so I am sure that the Senator will cooperate with me in making an exception in this instance.

Mr. SPENCER. In other words, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi first makes some charge which he thinks needs an answer, and then, upon the basis of the charge which he himself has made, he says that because of the right of the man himself we ought to have an open executive session to discuss the matter. That does not appeal to me as being a very strong argument.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not make any charge. This article was from the New York Times, and they say that Mr. Goldstein himself said that he got the \$2,500 and placed it in the bank to his credit in order to create Lowden sentiment in Missouri.

Mr. SPENCER. I was under the impression that the article was put in at the instance of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; for the information of the Senator, and the Senate, and the country.

PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, I have no disposition to discuss the reasons for the defeat of any candidate in the recent elections, because that has been done before by other Senators. I wish to observe, however, that in my opinion one of the elements which are making it difficult for some people to come back to Congress is the Volstead law, and especially that feature of it which permits a man to invade the sanctity of a home at night without a search warrant.

In order to bear out this statement, I wish now to offer a copy of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana in the year 1921, addressed to the Vice President and by him referred to me, and ask that it be inserted in the RECORD in 8-point type.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5.

Whereas the Congress of the United States is at the present time considering a modification of the so-called Volstead Act prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquors for beverage purposes containing more than one-half of 1 per cent alcohol;

Whereas it is the desire of all that the Volstead Act should be amended and modified so as to permit the sale of light wines and beer in wholesale quantities under proper Government restrictions: Be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Louisiana and*the House of Representatives concurring, That the Congress of the United States be requested to modify and amend the so-called Volstead Act so as to permit the sale and manufacture of light

wines and beer in wholesale quantities under proper Government restrictions.

HEWITT BOUANCHAUD,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.
R. F. WALKER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I also wish to offer a letter addressed to me by the Grain Trade Association of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, inclosing a copy of a letter to the President of the United States, and making a similar plea. I ask that this be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

GRAIN TRADE ASSOCIATION OF SAN FRANCISCO
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
San Francisco, April 20, 1922.

Hon. EDWIN S. BROUSSARD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BROUSSARD: Inclosed herewith we hand you reprint from the San Francisco Daily Commercial News, dated April 15, from which you will see that 5,044 separate landowners, owning in the aggregate 5,297,821 acres of land, have petitioned our association to use its best efforts to bring about legislation so as to allow the manufacture and sale of light wines and beer.

Yours very truly,

GRAIN TRADE ASSOCIATION OF THE
SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By W. BELKNAP, Secretary.

[Reprinted from Daily Commercial News, April 15, 1922.]

GRAIN TRADE ASSOCIATION ADDRESSES LETTER TO PRESIDENT HARDING.

The Grain Trade Association of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce yesterday sent the following letter to President Harding:

SAN FRANCISCO, April 14, 1922.

Hon. WARREN G. HARDING,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We take the liberty of advising you that during the past few weeks we have been requested over the separate signatures of 5,044 landowners, owning in the aggregate 5,297,821 acres land, devoted to all sorts of agriculture, etc., in California, to use our best efforts in helping to bring about an amendment to the Volstead Act, so as to legalize the manufacture and sale of light wines and beer.

Recently the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, California State convention of organized labor, San Francisco Stock and Bond Exchange, Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, and various other organizations, either voted unanimously, or almost unanimously, in favor of the same amendatory legislation.

Your interest and support of such proposed legislation is therefore respectfully requested by us.

Faithfully yours,

GRAIN TRADE ASSOCIATION OF THE
SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
F. A. SOMERS, Chairman.
D. BELKNAP, Secretary.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I also wish to insert in the RECORD a recent editorial in order to prove the correctness of the predictions we made during the consideration of the antisearch legislation finally adopted by this Congress, that the prohibition agents would invade the homes and disregard the constitutional privileges of citizens. In order to bear out those predictions I offer also, to be printed in 8-point type, an editorial from the Baltimore Sun, reproduced in the Washington Post of April 27, 1922, describing how prohibition agents in the early hours of the morning forced their way into the residence of a citizen of Maryland and shot up the place while the occupant of that residence was sleeping.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ASK FOR THE WHOLE TRUTH.
[From the Baltimore Sun.]

The prohibition authorities at Washington owe it to themselves, as well as to the people of this State, to investigate thoroughly the so-called "raid" of "dry" agents from the Capital against the home of Frank A. Lutz, near Knoxville, Frederick County. Mr. Lutz's version of the affair is that he was aroused from sleep at an early hour of the morning by some one knocking loudly on his front door. When he asked who was there, the answer was the imperative demand, "Let us in."

When he refused, one of the men attempted to force an entrance, whereupon Mr. Lutz shot through the door to frighten the intruders off and was answered by a fusillade from the assailants. He then telephoned to a neighbor, Mr. Meyer, and on his arrival the men without began firing into the house again, shattering the glass transom and slightly wounding Mr. Meyer. Mr. Lutz returned their fire and they retreated. He then telephoned the sheriff, who, with two deputies, hurried to the scene. They were admitted and the "raiders" entered the house with them, disclosing themselves as prohibition officers and attempting to search the premises. According to our dispatch it was then revealed that they had no search warrant and were not allowed by the officers to proceed.

If this is an accurate description of what occurred, nothing more lawless or high-handed has been staged by enforcement officers under the present régime. It can not be minimized or overlooked, and if the prohibition authorities do not probe it to the bottom the Department of Justice should take it up. If these "dry" agents made this night attack on the home of a citizen in the country, presumably without protection, and with no legal warrant to justify their attempted invasion, they were as much criminals, to all legal intents and purposes, as if they had been bandits or burglars. They have committed an act of criminal violence and should be punished, not merely reprimanded or discharged.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I wish also to have inserted in the RECORD, in 8-point type, extracts from speeches made yesterday in the city of New York by James Speyer, banker; Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor; and James P. Holland, president of the State Federation of Labor of New York. Mr. Holland's speech containing a quotation from a letter written by our good friend the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]; also an extract from the annual report of Bishop Lawrence, of the Episcopal diocese of Massachusetts, to the diocesan convention on May 3, 1922.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 4, 1922.]

CAPITAL AND LABOR UNITE AGAINST DRY—SPEYER, BANKER, AND GOMPERS DEMAND MODIFICATION AT BIG "WET" RALLY—INSIST CONGRESS MUST HEED—"TERRIBLE MISTAKE MADE," SAYS WADSWORTH—MAXIM CALLS DRY "MERCILESS PRIESTHOOD."

(By the Associated Press.)

NEW YORK, May 3.—Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, speaking to-night to a crowd that jammed Madison Square Garden in a mass meeting called by the New York branch of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, declared that labor "must make the fight now, and we will never stop fighting until the rights of the people have been restored to them."

He was cheered by crowds both inside and outside the big pavilion, for those who could not get into the hall heard the various speakers through voice amplifiers. The meeting was largely attended by members of union labor, representatives of more than 30 labor organizations being present. There also were many men prominent in the city's business and financial circles, who occupied places on the stage. A large part of the audience was composed of women.

"I and the federation I represent," Mr. Gompers said, "are in favor of beer and light wines and against any attempt to enforce sumptuary laws aimed at the personal liberties of our people."

LAYS LOWER MORALITY TO DRY.

"I have always had faith in the future of my country, but with prohibition I am apprehensive of that future. Temperance was the rule of the great mass of organized labor, but the prohibitionists and the so-called Anti-Saloon League have done more to undermine the morality and temperance of the workingman than any other agency I know."

"I have traveled all over the United States before prohibition, including its so-called dry territories, and to-day as I pass through these sections I find more drunkenness than ever before."

"There are no stronger or more powerful supporters of the Volstead Act than the distillers and bootleggers," Mr. Gompers declared to the accompaniment of vociferous applause. "With the Volstead Act and prohibition replaced by a light wine and beer bill the bootleggers would go out of business."

CALLS SPONSORS VIOLATORS.

Mr. Gompers, declaring that there are "no greater violators of the Volstead Act and the prohibition amendment than those who voted for their enactment," brought his talk down to local issues, saying that of New York's 25 Members of the House of Representatives, more than 20 were absent "from their posts

of duty" on the day that the eighteenth amendment was voted on.

Labor's dissatisfaction with the liquor laws was also expressed by James P. Holland, president of the State federation of labor, who also spoke.

Mr. Holland declared that if the Representatives in Congress from New York did not listen to the demands of the people, "others will be put in who would."

"The Congressmen of this State," he said, "must listen to the demand of the citizens of New York, who insist on a modification of the Volstead Act."

"I have here a letter from one New York Senator which shows he still believes in the Constitution of the United States—JAMES W. WADSWORTH."

WADSWORTH SEES "TERRIBLE MISTAKE."

Senator WADSWORTH's letter said, in part:

"Frankly, I think we made a terrible mistake when we inserted a sumptuary law of this kind in the Constitution of the United States. This was a fundamental error. Then we made another mistake when we passed an enforcement act so severe in its provisions that it is proving impossible of enforcement."

James Speyer, banker, who opened the meeting, said what he personally disliked more than anything else about the Volstead Act was that "it is fast degenerating into class legislation, favoring the well to do as against the less fortunate ones of our citizens." He was opposed, he said, to any kind of class legislation.

Hudson Maxim, another speaker, said that "the blue-law fanatics of prohibition are a new priesthood, intolerant and merciless."

BISHOP LAWRENCE DEMANDS FREE SPEECH ON PROHIBITION.

BOSTON, May 3.—Bishop William Lawrence, of the Episcopal diocese of Massachusetts, in his annual report to the diocesan convention to-day asked whether it was not time to recognize the right of every citizen who did not believe in constitutional prohibition to say so, and in public.

"Hundreds of thousands of workingmen who found solace and comradeship after the day's work in what they felt to be their innocent glass of beer had it snatched from them," the bishop said, "and thousands of thousands of reputable citizens found their personal liberties and domestic habits broken in upon."

"Surely it is competent for every citizen to speak, work, and do everything consistent with the law to have a law either amended or rescinded."

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After three minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously made, until to-morrow, Friday, May 5, 1922, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 4 (legislative day of April 20), 1922.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Leo Clark Wilder to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

John S. Amos, Enterprise.
Charlie S. Robbins, Good Water.

FLORIDA.

Boyd C. Foxworthy, Fort Myers.
Herbert W. Fuller, New Smyrna.
Mamie E. Barnes, Plant City.
James L. Pattillo, Fort Orange.

GEORGIA.

Esther McCollum, Conyers.
Beulah L. McCall, Hinesville.
Awtrey C. Moore, Powder Springs.
Gussie C. Lyon, Roswell.

INDIANA.

Josiah J. Hostetler, Shipshewana.

KENTUCKY.

Samuel C. Hedden, Shelbyville.

MICHIGAN.

Herman A. Ehman, Beulah.
Eugene E. Hubbard, Hudsonville.

MISSOURI.

Ferd D. Lahmeyer, Bland.
Walter E. Pearson, Clarksdale.
Andrew S. Swafford, Excelsior Springs.
Elizabeth E. Letton, Mindenmines.

NEW MEXICO.

Morgan P. Harvey, Clayton.

NORTH DAKOTA.

J. Rodney Williams, Hampden.
Martin H. Weber, New Leipzig.
John V. Kuhn, Richardton.

OKLAHOMA.

Joseph G. Chapplear, Gotebo.
Bert A. Hawley, Leedey.

OREGON.

Newton A. Perry, North Portland.

WASHINGTON.

Carl J. Gunderson, East Stanwood.
Ray E. Simons, Leavenworth.

WYOMING.

Elmer W. Ace, Green River.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, May 4, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Unto Thee, O Lord, do we offer our tribute of praise and thanksgiving. Our trust and our hope are in the infinite mercy and goodness of God. In a world so varied, quivering with uncertainty and veiled with mystery, we are so grateful that we have a Father in heaven and in earth who claims us as his own. The days are so packed with thought and so full of purpose. O set us to our high tasks. Do Thou quicken the living, breathing, budding divinity within us. May the hand that holds the earth, the seas, and the stars in their places direct us and establish our work. In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CONTINUANCE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS.

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 132, and to insist on the amendments of the House and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 132 and to insist on the House amendments and to agree to the conference asked by the Senate. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the title of Senate Joint Resolution 132, to provide for continuance of certain Government publications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from Pennsylvania conferred with the minority member of the Printing Committee about this resolution?

Mr. KIESS. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it satisfactory?

Mr. KIESS. Absolutely.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. KIESS, Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, and Mr. STEVENSON.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 191. Joint resolution favoring the establishment in Palestine of the national home for the Jewish people.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amend-